THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

328.712
C162
1885[2]

I'm green
>30% Biobased
Verified by ASTM D6866
CoLibri
COVER SYSTEM
Made in Italy

DEBATES

—OF—

THE SENATE

—OF THE—

DOMINION OF CANADA

1885.

REPORTED EDITED, AND PUBLISHED

BY

HOLLAND BROS.,

Official Reporters of the Senate of Canada, Ottawa.

VOL. II.

THIRD SESSION—FIFTH PARLIAMENT.

OTTAWA:
PRINTED BY A. S. WOODBURN, ELGIN STREET,
1885.

328.712
C162
1885 2

THE DEBATES

—OF THE—

SENATE OF CANADA

SESSION OF 1885.

VOL. II.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Tuesday, April 28th, 1885.

The Speaker took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS OF THE DOMINION.

ORDER POSTPONED.

The order of the day having been read, that he (Mr. Alexander) will call attention to the present state of the Public Affairs of the Dominion, and will ask the Government how they propose to remedy existing evils?

HON. MR. ALEXANDER said: At the request of different hon. members of this House, I would ask permission to postpone this motion until Friday, 1st May.

The motion was agreed to, and the order of the day was discharged, and fixed for Friday next.

THE SENATE DEBATES.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ADOPTED.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE moved the adoption of the first report of the select committee on the reporting of the Debates and Proceedings of the Senate. He said: Before proposing the adoption of the report I wish to call the attention of the House to a difference in the French and English versions of this report. In the English version—in the eighth clause in the tender of the Messrs. Holland—it is stated that for every page after the 600 pages they are to receive $2.50; in the French version it is stated as being $3.50. The arrangement actually made is for $2.50. Therefore, this error must be corrected.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The French is to be corrected.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—We propose an increase in the rate to be paid to the contractors; but on the other hand, we have arranged that instead of a minimum of 500 pages, it will be 600. Instead of paying $3.50 for every page extra it shall be only $2.50, and, in addition, the reporters are to arrange with the proprietors of the *Citizen* and *Free Press* to report and publish a synopsis of the Debates in this House in their daily issues. I simply move the adoption of the report.

The motion was agreed to and the report was adopted.

THE COX DIVORCE BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. MR. READ moved the adoption of the report of the select committee to whom was referred Bill (H), "An Act for the relief of George Brantford Cox." He said: The evidence is now before the House and it is so conclusive that I think there can be no doubt in anybody's mind that the conclusion arrived at by the committee was a proper one. If necessary, the adoption of the report can be postponed for a day or two, as the evidence

572753

was only distributed to day; but if hon. gentlemen have looked over it—it is very short—they will see that there could be no doubt at all in the minds of the committee. I may say the committee were unanimous; they did not occupy over an hour, or an hour and a half in examining the witnesses, and it is the most conclusive case that has ever been presented to the Senate, so far as I am aware.

The motion was agreed to on a division.

HON. MR. READ moved that the Bill be read the third time presently.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

WEST ONTARIO PACIFIC RAILWAY CO'S BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. MR. O'DONOHOE, in the absence of Mr. Plumb, moved the second reading of Bill (94), "An Act to incorporate the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company,"

The motion was agreed, to and the Bill was read the second time.

PAWNBROKERS' BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (R), "An Act to make further provision respecting Pawnbrokers."

In the Committee.

HON. MR. GOWAN—The first and only clause in this Bill is very short. The House is already in posession of the principles upon which this Bill is based, and the enactment is short and simple, and will provide a remedy which has been suggested by the court and judges as necessary in order to secure those who are very open to fraud aud impositions from being defrauded and imposed upon by persons who are disposed to do so.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—What is the rate of interest authorized by law?

HON. MR. GOWAN—I cannot exactly say the rate; it requires some computation. It is five-sixths of a cent per month on sums not exceeding four dollars, and I think, so far as I can state without computation, it is equal to about 17 per cent.

HON. MR. DICKEY—The Committee will be entitled to some further information on this Bill. It evidently refers to some existing law. As far as I know there is no law applicable to the whole Dominion at present on our statute book. There is the proposed consolidation of the statutes of the late province of Canada, and the acts passed in the province of New Brunswick, but this is an act that applies to the whole Dominion, and the reason I call my hon. friend's attention to it is that this Bill provides that—"Every pawnbroker who charges in respect of any goods pawned any higher rate than is authorized by law shall, on conviction be fined, etc." Now, as regards the application of this in parts of the Dominion where there is no existing law respecting pawnbrokers, it would be nugatory and would introduce rather an element of confusion into the statute. I also submit to the Minister of Justice that, with regard to this Bill, it would very properly be an amendment to the Act, or a clause to be introduced in the consolidation of the laws, if there is a chapter relating to this subject of pawnbrokers brought in—I suppose on the idea that it is within the purview of the Dominion Parliament—and this, certainly, would be a proper matter, if at all to be dealt with, to be included in that section.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Should it pass both Houses, it will form part of the consolidation.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I do not know exactly about that. Looking at the Bill in its present form, and without knowing whether the other chapters are to be passed, it is very confusing and incomplete, because it speaks of charges now entitled to be made by law, and at the same time there is no law particularly applicable to that subject except the general law of interest, and the law of interest would be the one, in the absence of any

law on the subject, that I presume would regulate this matter.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—In the absence of any other law. As to the provisions of the Bill, I leave the hon. member from Barrie to defend his own measure; but should the Bill pass both Houses of Parliament, the provision we propose to put in the Act for making the consolidation of the law would embrace it, and would embrace any other change which is made during the present session. They would be included in the consolidation and form part of it.

HON. MR. DICKEY—Should they pass.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I think my hon. friend will find that the provision with regard to the remuneration to be taken by pawnbrokers is to be found in the consolidated statutes of Canada, and applies to Ontario and Quebec. It is also found in the revised statutes of New Brunswick. I am not aware that it is in the statutes of the other provinces. It is the present law of New Brunswick, and is so treated by the consolidators.

With regard to the power of the Dominion to enact laws respecting pawnbrokers, it is quite clear; it is a matter of interest, and has been so treated by the consolidators, in the consolidation. If there is no law in force in the provinces to which it will extend no doubt it would not apply, but I rather think there is. I have no objection to meet the views of my hon. friend to say "by any act or acts relating to pawnbrokers" if that would help it at all, but I do not know that that would make any difference. The Bill is framed with a view to be worked into the consolidation, should it pass both Houses. The consolidators propose to make this law general. In treating of the subject they thought it was a valuable law, and that there should be one law for the whole Dominion, as the Dominion has power to deal with interest, and they have consolidated with a view to applying it to the whole Dominion of Canada, and this Bill is in keeping with that. Of course if it passes it will be engrafted with it. I can-

W 1

not see myself any practical difficulty to arise.

HON. MR. ALMON—I may state that there is no pawnbroker's place of business in Halifax, and I doubt if there is in Nova Scotia. My hon. colleague will corroborate this; whether he attributes it to the National Policy which has taken away poverty and distress, I do not know, but that is the fact; there is no pawnbroker's establishment in Halifax.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not think there is any regular pawnbroker's establishment in Halifax.

HON. MR. READ—That is the effect of the National Policy.

HON. MR. POWER—They had not any before the National Policy.

HON. MR. ALMON—The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I remember when there was.

HON. MR. POWER—That was before I was born perhaps. There has not been any within my recollection. I took the precaution to inquire into this subject, as I said I should yesterday, and I have satisfied myself that there is not anything *ultra vires* in the Bill.

I rise now, in addition to corroborating my hon. colleague, for the purpose of suggesting that a few words might be added to this Bill, which I think would improve it. The object of the Bill is to remove a defect in a chapter of the consolidated statutes. That chapter does not provide any penalty for a violation of the regulations which it makes as to the rate of interest to be taken by a pawnbroker. This little Bill provides a punishment for violating that provision of the statute, but I think it would be well to add a few words. A party is liable to a penalty not exceeding $50, and I think we should add, "or in default to imprisonment for a period not exceeding 30 days." I think there should be that alternative to enforce the payment of the $50. My hon. friend probably thinks that is provided for by other statutes. I looked into the matter this forenoon, and I think it would puzzle the proverbial Philadelphia lawyer

to find where that provision is, and what its exact meaning is when found; and I think it would make the law a great deal clearer, and remove difficulty, if that addition was made to the Bill.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I have not the slightest objection to accept the hon. gentleman's amendment, but I think it would be covered by the clause to convict summarily. I may say that I showed the Bill to the Minister of Justice, and that he thought these words would be sufficient; at the same time if there is the slightest doubt on the matter there can be no objection to adding the words suggested by my hon. friend.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It seems to me there is some doubt An appeal has been taken, that I know of myself, in the last year, in a matter very similar in character to this, where the offence is not enumerated under the Summary Convictions Act.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I am very much obliged to my hon. friend from Halifax for assisting me to perfect the measure, and I accept his amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

HON. MR. ARCHIBALD, from the committee, reported the Bill as amended.

The report was concurred in.

HON. MR. GOWAN moved that the Bill be read the third time presently.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I think this Bill ought to be further amended, unless we are to pass our legislation in a very slip-shod manner. This is an Act to make further provisions respecting pawnbrokers, and there is no provision now by law with regard to pawnbrokers which applies to the whole Dominion. It appears to me that the Bill, as it stands now, is an absurdity on the face of it, both in the enacting clause and in the title, when there is no provision for pawnbrokers in the Dominion, except in three provinces.

HON. MR. POWER—If the consolidated statutes become law, as it is intended at present, at the expiration of this session, under a Bill that has been introduced in the other House, then this chapter of the consolidated statutes will apply to the whole Dominion, and this Bill to amend that chapter will apply in the same way, and I do not think that the difficulty is quite as great as my hon. friend supposes. There is a good deal of force, however, in what the hon. gentleman from Amherst says, though I do not think it is a very serious difficulty.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

THE INDUSTRIES AND MANUFACTURES OF THE DOMINION.

THE DEBATE CONCLUDED.

The order of the day having been called for resuming debate on the Hon. Mr. Macdonald's motion, viz.:

That he will call attention to the Report of the Commission issued by the Government last year to enquire into the effect of the Tariff of 1879, on the industries and manufactures of the country, and will ask the Governmant whether the report will be furnished to members of the Senate and a certain number to the country?

HON. MR. McCLELAN said:—The debate on this question has been so protracted and there have been so many adjournments of the discussions, that anyone undertaking to address this Chamber now must labor under very considerable disadvantages. The interest in the subject, I suppose, has considerably flagged. When I was interrupted some weeks ago in my remarks I was then referring to the extraordinary exodus of the people from Canada, and especially from the lower provinces. I propose, with the permission of hon. gentlemen, to return to that question, and to complete my remarks on that branch of the subject; but before doing so I would like to refer to a matter, in my remarks on which I was somewhat interrupted by the junior member from Halifax, and in which he made some reference to the character of the petitions that have, of course, become a matter of history, and which were gotten up in the principal cities of Great Britain, with a view to bringing about a

change in her trade policy with other countries. A good deal has been said about the condition of trade in England prior to the repeal of the corn laws. Inasmuch as my hon. friend has mentioned that as petitions are gotten up in a very loose kind of a way, and that perhaps they were not properly authenticated, or deliberately signed, it may be well to refer to "The History of British Commerce," by Leone Levi, a copy of which I hold in my hands :

"The experience of France and of all countries which followed her policy, might, indeed, have deterred England from relying with any confidence on the broken reed of protection ; but no intelligent opinion was formed on the subject, and the great works of Adam Smith and other economists had remained sterile of results, when, in 1820, the London merchants entrusted Mr. Baring, afterwards Lord Ashburton, with the famous petition prepared by Mr. William Tooke, which embodied a distinct enunciation of free-trade principles, and prayed that every restrictive regulation of trade, not imposed on account of the revenue, including all duties of a protective character, might at once be repealed."

I might say that the William Tooke above referred to was a prominent merchant in London. I think he was engaged principally in the Russia trade. He was a son of John Horne Tooke, a gentleman of considerable celebrity, and he himself, on account of his great literary attainments, and his contributions to the literature on trade and commerce, was subsequently honored by having the endowment of a professorship in the London University, in his name, made up by contributions from his admirers. Levi continues :—

"As this is the first practical step in the way of commercial reform, initiated by the mercantile classes, it is well deserving of a conspicuous place in any history of our modern commerce. * * * *

"The London merchants started from the first cardinal principles of trade—that foreign commerce is eminently conducive to the wealth and prosperity of the country, by enabling it to import the commodities for the production of which the soil, climate, capital and industry of other countries are best calculated, and to export in payment those articles for which its own situation is better adapted ; that freedom from restraint is calculated to give the utmost extension to foreign trade, and the best direction to the capital and industry of the country ; that the maxim of buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest, which regulates every merchant in his individual dealings, is strictly applicable as the best rule to the trade of the whole nation ; and that a policy founded on these principles would render the commerce of the world an interchange of mutual advantage, and diffuse increased wealth and enjoyments among the inhabitants of each state.

"The petitioners complained that the very reverse had been and was more or less adopted and acted upon by the Government of this and every other country, each trying to exclude the productions of other countries with the specious and well-meant design of encouraging its own productions; thus inflicting on the bulk of its subject, who are consumers, the necessity of submitting to privations in the quantity or quality of commodities, and thus rendering, what ought to be the source of mutual benefit and of harmony among states, a constantly recurring occasion of jealousy and hostility.

"The London merchants further argued, as respects the numerous protective and prohibitory duties of our commercial code, that while they were all operating as very heavy taxes on the community at large, very few were of any ultimate benefit to the classes in whose favor they were originally instituted, and none to the extent of the loss occasioned by them to other classes; that among the other evils of the restrictive or protective system, not the least was that the artificial protection of one branch of industry, or source of production against foreign competition, was set up as a grouud of claim by other branches for similar protection ; so that, if the reasoning upon which these restrictive or prohibitory regulations were founded, were followed out consistently, it would not stop short of excluding us from all foreign commerce whatsoever. * * * * * * *

"The petitioners then added that whilst declaring their conviction of the impolicy and injustice of the restrictive system, and in desiring every practicable relaxation of it, they had in view only such parts of it as were not connected, or were only subordinately so, with the public revenue. As long as the necessity for the present amount of revenue subsisted, the petitioners could not expect so important a branch of it as the customs to be given up, nor to be materially diminished, unless some substitute less objectionable be suggested. But it was against every restrictive regulation of trade, not essential to the revenue, against all duties merely protective, and partly for that of protection, that the prayer of the petition was submitted to the wisdom of Parliament.

"The Chamber of Commerce of Edinburgh, in that petition, attributed in a great measure the existing depression to the straightened condition of foreign commerce, the heavy duty on imports tending directly to lessen the demand for the produce of this country. They treated as erroneous the doctrine that wealth is promoted by an excess of exports, but alleged that, on the contrary, the profits of trade are realized by an excess of imports."

With reference to these petitions, I might notice that from that time forward the continued amount of pauperism, idleness and depression of trade existed in Great Britain, and Levi in his remarks on the commercial distress of that period, says :—

"In June, 1837, a large meeting was held in Birmingham, to consider what measures should be adopted, calculated to relieve the appalling state of commercial distress. At Nottingham a similar meeting was held, thousands of operatives being there employed on the roads by public subscription. At Manchester there were 50,000 hands out of employment, and most of those employed were working only half time. In Scotland there were many failures, and in Ireland the state of trade was still worse."

I refer to these extracts as having a bearing on remarks which were made in a former stage of the discussion, and in reply to the reasons alleged by Protectionists why, in the Mother Country, protection was abandoned and free trade inaugurated.

I was speaking the other day of the very great exodus from the Maritime Provinces during the last four years, though in many respect they were years of prosperity—an exodus which has been unprecedented. We are all perfectly aware that a great many people are restless, and shift their abodes from one country to another without exercise of careful judgment, but during my experience I have never noticed so much unrest, and so many people, not only single men and women who are attracted perhaps by larger wages in the United States, and some of whom may return, but many others. Freeholders with their families, many of whom have managed to sell their properties at a sacrifice, have gone to settle in the United States. This is a sad condition of things, and I speak only of what has come within my own observation. Wherever I could persuade persons against making such a change, I have, of course, done so, but the removal of these people from the land of their birth to a foreign country to live under a foreign flag is something which the Government of the country should always endeavor, as far as possible, to prevent. A great many evils may afflict the country, evils that may be considered very grave at the time, which are after all only a passing cloud from which the country can soon recover; but when the old residents leave their homesteads to settle in a foreign land, the loss is irreparable. We are losing a portion of our population which has been the pride of our country, and when such a population is once destroyed it can never be supplied. In support of my view as to the unprecedented number of people who have left Canada during the last three or four years, I shall quote some figures. The condition of Canada is different from that of an old country such as England. We possess a large area of undeveloped soil, and we are not running the risk of being over-crowded, as the hon. member from Lunenburg remarked in his speech, or of over-crowding the houses with families. There is no danger of that in Canada. But the other result is what we particularly dislike—the dispersion of our people. In order to corroborate my views with regard to the decrease of the population by removals, I may refer to the school statistics of New Brunswick which it appears to me are a pretty safe guide. The school system of New Brunswick of late years has been one under which every opportunity has been afforded to build good school houses and furnish accommodation so that children can be sent to school without having to travel a very long distance. Within a few years past there have been grants made to the poorer districts out of the provincial treasury, and that to a very large extent has helped to provide school accommodation for the poorer settlements; and, therefore, we would naturally have a right to conclude that the registration of pupils in those schools would increase very rapidly, provided there was only the natural increase of population, even without any influx of foreigners; but any gentlemen who will examine the school records of that province will find that in 1879 there were registered on the rolls 71,764 pupils, and in 1884, the registrar's report shows only 68,928, or a decrease of 2,836 upon the school registers of New Brunswick. This confirms the conclusion at which I had arrived from my own observation, and though it has been denied by the newspapers in some cases, I am sorry to say the denial has been incorrect. There has been a continual stream of emigration to Wisconsin, Washington Territory, Michigan, and even to the orange groves of Florida. We find in many parts of the United States, New

Brunswickers who have left the land of their birth during the last four years. I have not been able to place my hands upon the school returns of the other lower provinces, but I believe, from having noticed them last year, that they will indicate the same result. I believe the result in Ontario is still more apparent. In the province of Quebec, by a departmental report presented to the legislature of that province, by the deputy-registrar only a few weeks ago, that the value of real estate in that province in 1883, was $2,000,000 less than it was in 1882, and that officer attributes this decrease to the emigration of the people.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—Is that a report by the deputy-registrar?

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—Yes; one laid before the legislature. I found the extract in the Montreal *Witness* of April 2nd. I will read what the *Witness* says:—

A very interesting departmental report was distributed here to-day. It bears the title of "Municipal Statistics or Municipal Returns for the year ending the 31st of December, 1883," and is especially valuable as showing how utterly misleading as a reliable enumeration of our population was the *de jure* system insisted upon by the Dominion Government in taking the census of 1881. The compiler is the Deputy Registrar of the Province, and, in his introductory report to his departmental head, the Provincial Secretary, this efficient and independent officer, conscientiously and boldly puts the case in its true light. He says:—

"I have already called your attention to the great discrepancies which exist, with regard to population, between the figures contained in the municipal reports and those of the census made by the Federal Government in 1881. Since that date I have devoted my special attention to investigating these discrepancies, and the correspondence which I have carried on with the secretary-treasurers on this subject clearly shows that their figures giving the number of population are correct. The difference between these figures and those of the census arises from the difference in the system followed in making the enumeration. The census gives the population *de jure*, that is that which is considered as having its domicile within the province, while the municipal reports give the population *de facto*, that is the number of persons actually residing in the country. Thus, in the case of a family, three or four of whose members are in the United States, the census made by the Federal Government gives the full number of the family, while the municipal census gives only that of the members of the family who actually reside in the country." Elsewhere, he adds, that on the whole the municipal statistics he furnishes are as exact as official statistics can be, and that the information they contain can be relied on, and that from the reports sent in to him, it appears that the value of taxable real estate in this province has decreased by $2,203,412, or 1.13 per cent., that is to say, that it decreased from $197,230,170 in 1882 to $195,026,758 in 1883, this decrease being unquestionably attributable to emigration from the country, as was also the decrease of 34,468 acres, or 0.22 per cent. in the number of acres of land subject to assessment in 1883, as compared with 1882, the latter being especially explained by the abandonment of Crown lands occupied by settlers.

So that the returns of pupils registered in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Ontario, so far as I am informed (I can only give figures from New Brunswick), indicate pretty clearly that the great object of introducing a high protective tariff, in the way of keeping our young men at home, and filling up the country with industrious settlers, has not been attained.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Have they not gone to the North-West?

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—There is considerable evidence to show that there has not been anything like the number of people entering into the North-West that has gone from the south-east. More people have moved away from the Maritime Provinces than have entered the North-West.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—There is no proof of that.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—The population of the North-West is not definitely known, but in the whole country there is not over 130,000 or 140,000 people, and judging from the small percentage of the local volunteers who are armed, and who would be the most efficient troops to subdue the unfortunate insurrection in that country, one would naturally suppose that the population had not reached beyond that estimate at any rate. When one looks at the appliances for settling that country it

seems remarkable that so few have entered there. One cannot help reverting to the arguments used, the statements made, and the prophecies uttered as to the immense population that would flow into that country from the inauguration of the Pacific Railway, and the discussion which took place during the passage of the Syndicate resolutions. One great reason that was given why we should not haggle with this wealthy syndicate was, that they had foreign agents, foreign capital and great influence abroad, and that, having retained alternate sections of land and having an interest in the profits of the road, they would bring their powerful influence and appliances to bear in a way that would strengthen the hands of the Government very much in filling that country with population. Then, again we have the interest and influence of the Hudson Bay Company, which retained one-twentieth of the whole of that country. It was stated that they would assist in peopling the territories, and we know very well that subsequently the Colonization Company boom was inaugurated. In fact every facility was given for the formation of wealthy companies in Germany, England and this country, and colonization companies were formed; there were companies organized by different Christian denominations, by the press association, and all through Ontario there was more or less of this fever for being connected in some way with a colonization company. The Government possessed all these means of settling the North-West, which we were told, was our great western heritage, but with all these advantages combined with enormous expenditure, and with the National Policy to aid them, the settlement of that country has not, I am sure, met the expectations of any hon. gentleman even in this House. The policy of rapid construction was, in my humble judgment, against the proper organization of a settled and contented population in that country. Unless you have a contented population no government can succeed in their efforts at colonization. If a settler has been boomed in, if he has been brought over by an assisted passage, if he has been to a certain extent pauperized in the beginning and made dependent, he goes there with a false impression of the country. He goes there to find that he has no immediate neighbors, and it is impossible for him to have any within a reasonable distance, and the discontent thus created is the beginning of troubles, and difficulties, and petitions of right, and claims of all kinds set up, and difficulties arising which would not arise if the colonization had been kept within closer bounds—if the settlement had been confined within narrower limits —until such time as further area was required for settlement. The rapid construction of the railway, it appears to me, was not calculated to produce a useful result. It is well known that a judicious expenditure of money on a public work will aid settlement, but a rapid expenditure of money necessitates bringing in a transient population from the United States who simply work for gain and leave for their homes when the work is over. There was not that steady expenditure which would have taken place if the road had been pushed on in accordance with the requirements of settlement only; hence the occupation of the North-West is not at all equal to our expectations. If it had been according to our expectations we would have been saved a great deal of the difficulties which have occurred since, up to the present time, and untold difficulties and expense which may be entailed upon us in the future.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Wait until the road is finished.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—In addition to the statement which I have brought forward to prove the diminished population of the country, I might make a passing reference to the increasing rate of emigration of Canadians to the United States, as shewn by the Bureau of Statistics. In connection with this subject of immigration, I was referring previously to its effects upon values. We all know very well that when more people are leaving a place than are coming in, when there are more sellers than there are buyers, property will very greatly depreciate, and that depreciation has, with some few exceptions, existed in almost every district in the province from which I have the honor of coming; and not only has depreciation taken place with regard to farming lands, but it has also taken place

with regard to ships, and to some extent in the lumber trade, although not so much. The price of lumber has not depreciated to the same extent as it did in 1878 and 1879; but considering that investments in land have become unprofitable, it was natural enough that a great many people in casting about for places to invest the surplus money they might have, should put it in the savings bank. That is not a point which any one need allude to, because it proves nothing one way or the other. It seems to be necessary and proper to make some reference to it, however, owing to the fact that it has already been alluded to; but in my humble judgment it is no proof of prosperity or the reverse.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Sir Richard Cartwright said it was.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am not speaking in any way for Sir Richard Cartwright. I am endeavoring to express my own sentiments. Of course a large amount of money in the banks of the country is no indication of a surplus of money in the hands of the people. I think, if my hon. friend will examine the amounts, he will find that many of them are to the credit of individuals, the large proportion of whom have deposited up to the full limit of $3,000, and if he makes a close examination—I am speaking now so far as my observation extends—he will find that often more than $3,000 has been deposited by one individual in the names of his sons and daughters. I have myself deposited money at the request of some persons in that way. They were not the poorer classes; they were the wealthier people, and many of them farmers, and shipowners. With us there is a class of people to whom I have already alluded—young men who have become commanders of ships. They are men who, it is well known by hon. gentlemen from the lower provinces, command very high wages. Although the profits of those ships have diminished, the rate of wages paid to officers has not materially diminished, and their earnings, consequently, are considerable. A very large amount of the deposits have been made by that class of the community, for the reason, as I said in my former remarks, that the smaller vessels, the nursery of our mercantile marine has been, by the high tariff, cut off from return freights, and they have found it unprofitable to invest money in ships, in which they have always taken a lively interest; and hence, having no way of making their investments profitable, in their judgement, they naturally placed it in government savings banks, at 4 per cent. Speaking of this savings bank question, I would call attention to another fact, taken from the London *Mail* of February 19th, 1883, which I will read to the House:

"The total increase of deposits in the savings banks in Ireland for the year ending December 31st, 1880, over the previous year was £1,732,503. The increase in Ireland just now (1881) has a peculiar significance, the amounts exceeding by £138,500 the total of the previous year placed in the savings bank. Ten thousand new depositors were also enrolled; every county in Ireland contributing its quota, and the increase in the eight counties scheduled as distressed, amounted to £8,448 over and above the growth of the previous year, viz: £33,866 against £25,618. Not bad for a starving country."

So that the conclusion which some hon. gentlemen have attempted to arrive at from the fact that the deposits in the savings banks have increased, must be considered by this evidence, which certainly cannot be gainsaid, as utterly refuted, and must fall to the ground.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Can the hon. gentleman give us the particular classes of people — whether servants, mechanics, laborers, or agriculturists—who deposited this money?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—If my hon. friend turns to his own speech he will find a classification.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I gave a classification of the deposits made in the savings banks in this country; but we want to know the classification of those deposits in Ireland.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am unable to give the classification of the deposits in Ireland. This extract from the *Mail* shows that the increase in the deposits in the savings banks has been greatest in the distressed districts, and that ought to satisfy my hon. friend, so far as drawing any conclusion about the amount of deposits

in the savings bank being an indication of the prosperity of the country is concerned. It simply indicates that in many instances the state of the country is such that no other kind of investment is profitable.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—It has no bearing whatever on our case. I am very glad to hear that my countrymen had so much money to deposit.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I would not refer to the question of savings bank deposits at all, but having heard it spoken of so very often as being a matter of proof of the prosperity of the country, I thought it was only fair to make a passing reference to it. Having got through that branch of the subject which had reference mainly to the savings bank argument, and having referred to the relations of trade with the prosperity of different countries, I beg leave to make some reference to the opinions of prominent men upon this question; because, while one hon. gentleman may express one opinion, and another hon. gentleman may express another opinion, very little result comes from it, as we may be more or less moved by our political antecedents, or by our political proclivities, or by other considerations; but the opinions of distinguished men, who are not influenced by any personal or party considerations, ought to have some weight. I would not refer to this branch of the subject if it had not been that previous speakers have made similar references, and therefore I am sure the House will excuse me if I quote from the remarks of some gentlemen of distinction. In doing this, I do not intend to refer to such writers as Adam Smith, or to great reformers like Cobden, Bright or Gladstone, or to such a great authority as Beaconsfield. All of them had very strong views on this question of free trade.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Beaconsfield was not a free trader.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I will not refer to remarks of prominent politicians in the United States, although my hon. friend from Niagara thinks that the intelligence of the public men of the neighboring republic is of a higher order than that of the public men of England, and their opinions would no doubt be listened to with more attention than the opinions of the British statesmen whose names I have mentioned. It is not necessary perhaps to refer to such prominent men as President Cleveland or Mr. Wells, who have written so much on this great question, and whose opinions are so well known; but there is one gentleman to whom reference has been made in the debate—Sir A. T. Galt—I wish to refer to a speech which he delivered some years ago to the merchants of Toronto.

HON. MR. READ—He has changed his opinions since then.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—In that speech Sir A. T. Galt said:—

> If we are to succeed in getting immigrants into Canada, we must not lose sight of the fact that it must be made attractive to them. It must be a cheap country; immigrants must not find that it is as dear as other countries, which perhaps offer more advantages. That leads me to a consideration of the question of the high duties on imports. High rates have unquestionably made the United States a dear country, and Canada is a comparatively cheap country because of its moderate duties, which afford perhaps the most direct compensation for the natural advantages which the adjoining Republic possesses over the Dominion. (Hear) I do not believe there is any advantage whatever in the doctrine of extreme protection. (Renewed applause.) I do not believe it is possible to develop manufactures on any large scale by high duties. Our market is too limited, we have only four millions of people to supply, and it must be perfectly clear that the result of high duties would be to create an artificial industry which does not rest on its own intrinsic merit. It is to be observed that protection—high duties—enhance the cost of every other article, as well as that in which a particular manufacturer may be interested. It renders it more expensive for every manufacturer to manufacture his goods. If everything the boot and shoe maker uses is protected by high duties it is evident that his goods must be dearer. The result would consequently be that the exportation of our surplus goods to foreign countries would become absolutely impossible. We cannot have an export trade if the goods are artificially made dear in this country. We have in the United States a most complete example of that. That is a country which ought to be the cheapest country in the world, which has the largest amount of available land and every material advantage, and yet by a wrong system of legislation and economic policy the people have succeeded for many years past in making it one of the

dearest countries in the world instead of the cheapest. (Applause)."

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It has got cheaper since then.

HON. MR. READ—He has lived long enough to see the error of his ways.

HON. MR. SMITH—I would ask the hon. gentleman a question. He says that the policy of our Government is driving the people away from this country. I want to know what country they are going to that is less protected than the Dominion? He says that they are going to the United States. If they are going to the United States, they are going to a country where the industries of the people are protected to a much greater extent than ours are, and therefore what country can they go to? If they go back to England they will find a worse condition of affairs prevailing there under free trade—every mechanic has been impoverished by the free trade policy, and they are beginning to find their mistake; the time is not distant when they will have to come back to protection. The people who are leaving here are going to the North-West.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—The hon. gentleman from Toronto, instead of interrupting the debate, is making a speech.

HON MR. MCCLELAN—I am always glad to hear the hon. Minister express his views, but I may say to him that his speech on this occasion is rather inopportune—it does not come in at the right stage of my remark, and it is not original, as that question was put to me before by the hon. member from Niagara.

HON. MR. PLUMB—And was not answered.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—If I understand the hon. Minister he says that it is very strange that people leave this country because of the high protective tariff, and go to another country that is more highly protected. I cannot account for the people going there. Of course I am sorry that they are going, but I am only stating the fact that the National Policy that was intended to keep them from going out of the country, is having the opposite effect. It was set forth in the opening speech, and in the resolution of the hon. gentleman's own leader, that one of the objects of the National Policy was to keep the young men in the country.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—So it is.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—It was also to bring about a reciprocity treaty between this country and the United States, but we have seen very few steps taken by the Government since that policy was inaugurated to bring about reciprocity, which the people of the Lower Provinces anxiously await. When the 1st of July comes greater anxiety will awaken that some steps be taken by which reciprocal trade relations can be secured with the country with which we must trade, if we continue to exist as Maritime Provinces of this Union. It is impossible to cut us off from that legitimate business to which we have always been accustomed. But the hon. gentleman asks why people are leaving the country. I cannot undertake to explain the reasons that actuate people to leave one country and go to another. Some, I trust very few, leave their country for their country's good; but the greater part of them who leave the country are a loss to the country, and the Dominion is vastly injured by it. We lose our best settlers. There is one thing which, it strikes me, might be considered by my hon. friend in connection with the answer he has compelled me to make, that the United States, although inflicted with an enormous, and disastrous, and cruel civil war, by which their debt had largely increased, are greatly reducing that debt.

HON. MR. READ—By a protective policy.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—The policy of our leading men is to increase the public debt, and under that policy the debt of Canada to-day, *per capita*, is greater than the debt of the United States. They have many natural and other advantages over us; we have had some advantages over them, and I trust that we will have advantages still, which, in the future, will be more developed; but one of the advantages which this country possessed

over the neighboring Republic, was that it was a cheap country to live in. Another advantage, which I think we do possess, is, that we are living under a flag which our people were taught to revere, and we are proud to look to the prestige of old England, to her laws and institutions, to follow her example in protecting the liberties of the people, which she has so well inaugurated; and I trust we will yet be glad to follow her example in her trade policy.

HON. GENTLEMEN—No, no!

HON. MR. McCLELAN—We have failed to follow the example of England, and is it not natural that, having infringed upon the principles of freedom, which British statesmen have laid down, and having abandoned every principle of trade that is free and open, and increased the burden of public debt to some $250,000,000,—and, according to present appearances, before we meet here again it will be $300,000,000—until we are more heavily in debt, in proportion to our population, than are the people of the United States to-day, while ours is being increased, and theirs is being reduced, is it any wonder, therefore, that it has resulted in alienating the people, and sending them from the country? I say that when these things exist, and when this policy exists, it is natural that many of our people will say to themselves, that of two evils we will choose the less.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE — Hear, hear.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I have referred to the speech of Sir A. T. Galt, which I think is conclusive.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—He has changed his opinions since then.

HON. MR. POWER—He had ten thousand reasons for changing them.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Yes, while occupying his position as High Commissioner at $10,000 a year and a mansion. It is necessary, since it makes it more interesting, to refer to the opinions of other prominent men, and n pursuing that line, I will refer to a manifesto that was issued in the year 1849, and largely signed.

HON. MR. READ—That is before some of us were born.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am not going any further back than the hon. gentlemen who preceded me on the other side—I am not going so far back. If they undertook to go into history to prove the relations of one country with another—the trade relations, and give the opinions of prominent men as far back as Henry Clay—I think he was quoted by the hon. gentleman from Belleville himself, who said that Henry Clay had been a free-trader, and had changed to be a protectionist—I am justified in referring to the manifesto of 1849, which was signed by a great many prominent individuals in this country, and that is the reason why I shall give their opinions now: it is quite relevant to the discussion of this question. I am not finding any fault with those gentlemen for the opinions here expressed; I merely refer to them as a matter of history. It was a time of depression; it was a time at all events at which a number of influential, prominent, and astute people (the burning of the Parliament Buildings at Montreal happened under the same *regime* I believe) apparently had a large public meeting, at which a manifesto was drafted, by which they were proposing to revolutionize this country altogether, and in doing it they went about it very systematically, and debated one plan after another. It no doubt went very much against the grain of some of those hon. gentlemen at any rate to cut themselves adrift from the old flag. They had no doubt a considerable amount of the sentiment of loyalty in them, and although the times were hard and they were not making so much money in those years as before or since, still they felt that if they could recoup themselves in any other way than by a severance from England they would be glad to do so, but they could find no other way, and finding no other way they were prepared to take the step—cross the Rubicon, and unite with the United States. Yet my hon. friend says that he wonders now at individuals leaving this country for the

United States, when on the occasion I refer to nearly one thousand prominent men said over their own handwriting that they were prepared to come under United States jurisdiction.

HON. MR. SMITH—Things are in a very different state in Canada to-day.

HON. MR. PLUMB—How many years ago was that?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—They undertook to discuss the question of protection—the revival of protection in the markets of the United Kingdom; secondly the protection of home manufactures. In the remark on this they say that although this might encourage the growth of a manufacturing interest in Canada, yet without access to the United States market there would not be a sufficient expansion of that interest, from the want of consumers, to work any result that could be admitted as a "remedy" for the numerous evils of which they complain. That was a sensible and reasonable view which those wealthy and intelligent men entertained at that time. In the third place, discussing "a federal union of the British American provinces," they came to the conclusion that it would be no remedy, and it was therefore abandoned.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—We had only half the population then that we have now.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The fourth proposition was the "Independence of the British North American Colonies as a Federal Republic." That was discussed and found not to be a panacea. The fifth proposition was "reciprocal free trade with the United States as regards the products of the farm, the forest and the mine." This they concluded "if obtained would yield but an instalment of the many advantages which might otherwise be secured." The free interchange of such products would not introduce manufactures into our country. It would not give us the North American continent for our market. It would neither so amend our constitution as to confer stability, nor insure confidence in its permanence, nor would it allay the violence of parties, nor in the slightest degree remedy many of our prominent evils. The sixth proposition sets forth:

"Of all the remedies that have been suggested for the acknowledged and insufferable ills with which our country is afflicted, there remains but one to be considered. It propounds a sweeping and important change in our political and social condition involving considerations which demand our most serious examination. *This remedy consists in a friendly and peaceful separation from British connection, and a union upon equitable terms with the great North American Confederacy of sovereign states.*"

HON. MR. KAULBACH—My hon. friend does not pretend to say that that is the feeling in Canada now.

HON. MR. POWER—Did not the late High Commissioner sign that manifesto?

HON. MEMBERS—Read! Names!

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The signers arranged alphabetically are very numerous, but I will give you some of them. First there is Abbott, J. J. C., (hear, hear), Anderson, J. B., Grant, Glassford, &c. Among the Macs is observed the name of Macpherson, D. L., and others equally prominent representing all shades of politics.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—We had not Confederation then and we had not a National Policy. Does my hon. friend say that the feeling in the country now is in favor of annexation?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am merely referring to the opinions of public men upon a former occasion, when this manifesto was produced. I did not intend to bring out so prominently the sixth proposition in the manifesto, as others which were rejected. They were opposed to protection, and thought that it would not in the slighest degree remedy many of the existing evils. At the risk of being considered tedious, I wish to refer to the opinions of some other prominent men. I will now read from a Prince Edward Island newspaper of September 14th, 1878, the report of a meeting at Alberton:

HON. MR. PLUMB—What paper is it from?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The *Patriot.*

HON. MR. PLUMB—It is a bad authority.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—It is from a report of a meeting held at Alberton, 5th September, 1878. It says that Senator Howlan made a telling speech; that he said he was always a free trader, and is one yet. "Like others, he supposed, he had a right to change his opinions on this question, but he had not changed his. (Hear.)"

A further and fuller report of the meeting at Alberton, published on the 7th September, 1878, states :—

"After others had spoken, and in answer to loud and repeated calls, Senator Howlan took the floor, and upon stating that he had only come to listen, proceeded, amidst loud applause, to declare himself a free trader. He entered briefly into the state of affairs in Canada, showing that absolute free trade, as understood in England, was not possible in Canada, and no public men thought of it."

HON MR. PLUMB—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McCLELAN, continuing—

"He considered the tariff as already sufficiently high, and deprecated meddling with it, as tending to destroy the confidence needed to encourage commerce."

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear!

HON. Mr. McCLELAN, continuing—

"He considered protection a curse to any country. He had always been a free trader, and was so still, although this was the first opportunity he had to declare his views during this campaign. He expected to be called to account for these remarks in another place, and he was prepared for it."

HON. MR. SCOTT—This is the place.

HON. MR. McCLELAN, continuing—

"While Mr. Pope and others had changed their views, he had not done so. Mr. Howlan ridiculed the notion of reciprocal free trade and said we might as well talk musical free trade, or any other free trade; the phrase was meaningless. He entered at length into the question, exposing the fallacy of the protectionist argument, and fortified his position by many telling illustrations. Mr. Howlan spoke forcibly, and was frequently interrupted by bursts of applause."

HON. MR. POWER—He always does.

HON. MR. McCLELAN continuing—

"After a lively passage at arms between Messrs. F. F. White, and Mr. Hacket, the following resolution was proposed by Benjamin Rogers, Esq., seconded by Captain M. Foley;—

"Whereas this meeting having confidence in the trade policy of the Government, therefore—

"Resolved that this meeting will support the two government candidates—Messrs. Yeo and Perry at the coming election, and will use every legitimate means to secure their return to the Dominion House of Commons.

"On the vote, two only were found to oppose the resolution, out of an audience of about 150, and with three cheers for the free trade candidates, and three more for the free trade Senator, the meeting which was well attended and remarkably orderly adjourned."

The report was signed S. P. Fielding, secretary.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—With regard to the report of that meeting, I have always denied its accuracy and repudiated the statements attributed to me. But suppose I had entertained those opinions, there is no good reason why I should not change them from the logic of events. No public man should be bound by a newspaper report like that.

HON. MR. DICKEY—In an election campaign.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I remember reading his remarks at that time, and I recognized him with delight, as being a champion of the principles I maintain. I quite conceive the applause which greeted my hon. friend on that occasion. According to the old Latin proverb, the hon. gentleman, upon his own ground, ought to have made an excellent fight. I know from his ability, from his fluency and his eloquence, the meeting was electrified, as is evident from the enormous vote. It is a compliment to the hon. gentleman's power of persuasion and the force of his argument, and his ability, at any rate upon the stump, that such a remarkable result,

such a unanimous result ensued after that speech.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The hon. gentleman says it is not a correct report of his remarks.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—It is the report of the secretary of the meeting.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It is a partizan report.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—For the purpose of varying the matter a little, I will refer to an English authority, and will show that now, on the eve of an election in England, when so much has been attempted by certain parties to get a share of the loaves and fishes, a great deal has been said there about fair trade with a view of seducing the farmers and humbugging them and leading them astray on this matter of trade. On the eve of a new election, when they have had this plank in their platform of fair trade, the Tories of England are in full retreat on the question, and are most ingloriously backing down on the fair trade policy.

The farmers and the workers in all lines in England are unwilling to take the bait. They know full well how to count the cost of any duty on food and the other necessaries of life. They remember some of them the terrible times prior to the repeal of the corn law. Higher rents, dearer bread, more costly products, and consequently keener competition in the markets of the world.

Now, I come to the point I wish to make, and I will give the opinion of a very prominent gentleman, I think the leader of the great Conservative party of England—I speak of Sir Stafford Northcote. At a great political meeting in Somersetshire, to inaugurate the campaign in the Conservative interest, Sir Stafford Northcote was invited to attend, and replied by letter, in which he advised them to disclaim the "Protection Heresy." Said Sir Stafford :—

The Tory Premier, Peel, abolished the corn duties, and a return of the protectionist policy is impossible while the Conservative party lives to combat it. The idea that any Tory Government would return to the tax on cereals is groundless. Teach the English people that.

HON. MR. POWER—When was that letter writt n ?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I have not seen the letter, but I see it referred to in an English paper.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—What is good for an old country may not be suitable for a new country like Canada.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The letter from which I have quoted, was written to a conservative meeting held quite recently. With the permission of the House I shall now read the opinion of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, on fair trade, I quote from a report in the London *Mail* of September 23rd, 1881 :—

Yesterday evening a new Liberal club and association, which has been founded at Penrith, was inaugurated by a public meeting, held in the market-hall of that town. Mr. Henry Howard, of Greystoke Castle, presided, and among the speakers were Mr. E. Stafford Howard, M.P., Mr. George Howard, M.P., the Hon. A. D. Elliott, M.P., and Sir Wilfrid Lawson, M.P.

Sir Wilfrid Lawson, who on rising was loudly cheered, said there had been a great many conferences and congresses of late, but a meeting such as they were holding that night for the promotion of Liberal principles, was more useful than any of them. The late Lord Beaconsfield had explained some ten or fifteen years ago what great trouble he had had to educate his party; but now that he was gone it seemed as if the Conservatives, or some of them, were slipping back to some of the practices of the old-world Toryism. Some of them were crying for a return to the protection of British industry. They did not call it protection, they called it "reciprocity," or a policy of retaliation. A man who had aliases was generally a man of bad character. (Laughter.) Here was protection skulking about the country under the aliases of reciprocity and retaliation, and that ought to be enough to put people on their guard against such dangerous characters. (Cheers and laughter.) It did not do to put this thing down by brute force and call these people fools because they were going in for protection. Mr. Bright, in his righteous zeal, was vexed with them, and he was not going to find fault with him, but instead of calling them fools they should argue with them. That was the only way to treat anybody who you thought held erroneous opinions. In the first place, did they know what was the state of the country forty years ago, when the industry of the country was protected? There prevailed a state of degradation and misery which were a disgrace to the century and to the country,

and who benefitted by it? There was hardly a session of Parliament in which a squire or nobleman did not move for a commission to inquire into the distressed state of agriculture, which was the result of protection. Agricultural laborers were in a state of degradation and misery, and in the towns the weavers, spinners, and manufacturers were in a state of pauperism and wretchedness horrible to look back to. (Cheers.) All this was under the system of protection which these wise men wished to return to. The danger of such a state of things was that it would produce discontent with the institutions under which we live. The country had only been saved from revolution by sweeping away the system of protection, monopoly, and cruelty. (Cheers.) The result had been an enormous increase of trade, a prodigious increase of shipping, and an amazing increase of national wealth. (Cheers.) In support of this view he quoted Sir Stafford Northcote's book, "Our Financial Policy," published in 1862, to the effect that although there had been seasons of temporary local and partial suffering, and the changes had sometimes pressed hard upon particular districts, yet, on the whole, the condition of every portion of the community had been greatly improved by the new policy. (Cheers.) It was a pity the principle which had proved so beneficial should be swept away because it had begun to rain."

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It shows that there is an agitation for fair trade in England.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—Yes, and he is speaking against it. His whole speech is interesting, but I do not care to take up the time of the House reading it, because I have other speeches to which I wish to refer.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—My hon. friend might see that we are in a new country and that we ought to adopt the policy which England followed when her industries were in their infancy, too.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN — My hon. friend referred four times, in the course of his speech, to the enormous crowding of families in London, but I think it will be a long time before the chief city of his province, Halifax, is so over-crowded under the National Policy. I had occasion to refer, the other day, to the fact that in 1870 some opinions were expressed in this House on the subject of protection. At that time there was a measure brought forward to impose a tariff called the National Policy. The junior member from Belleville is not very happy in his memory of the history of this National Policy, because he did not refer to what was called the National Policy which was introduced and carried in 1870. There was a very close vote upon it in the Senate. That National Policy did not go so far in the way of protection as this one does. It provided for the imposition of a duty on coal, flour, salt, rice and a number of minor articles.

HON. MR. PLUMB—And Sir Charles Tupper said it was "the thin edge of the wedge," did he not?

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—He may have said so. In the discussion which took place in the Senate on that question, the hon. Senator from Saugeen, who is now the Minister of the Interior, moved the resolution in amendment, which was, practically, a three months' hoist, and, in the discussion on that, he took very strong grounds against the thin end of the wedge of protection, and that seemed to be the danger which pervaded his mind—that it would lead to higher protection, and that the whole principle of protection was wrong.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—A wise man may change his mind.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—Certainly, and I trust that my hon. friend from Lunenburg may change his; it is perfectly legitimate; I am not imputing any improper motives to anybody. I am merely quoting the opinion of public men—distinguished men—upon this question. In this connection I will refer to expressions from a speech delivered by the hon. Senator to whom I have just made reference, *inter alia*:—

"He believed it to be exceedingly unsound to impose a duty on coal and bread stuffs, or any natural products that were now free."

That is exactly in accordance with the views some of us entertain to-day. Then he continues—

"Then the duty would be a great obstruction to trade all through the country, which should, in accordance with the true principle of commerce, be left as unrestricted as possible.

"Not only would the tariff be worthless to

the people of Ontario, but most burthensome to the other sections, to the fishermen and the great masses of the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as well as Quebec, for it was a well-known fact that a large quantity of breadstuffs were yearly taken in the latter province from the United States. Then as a part of this great National Policy, a duty was imposed on foreign coal, as a means of propitiating Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec taxed to satisfy Ontario! Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick were to be burthened to please a minority in Nova Scotia! Nothing could be more calculated to create dissention and disturb the harmonious working of Confederation than such legislation."

Almost prophetic.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—He has lived to see his error.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—His words were almost prophetic, if one reads this in the light of the present day. Both in the west and in the east, even in the province from which my hon. friend from Lunenburg has the honor of coming—that province which he was kind enough to assure us the other day, was reposing in contentment, peace and happiness—

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—Even in the legislature of that province, a resolution, having for its object the dismemberment of the Union, was introduced and adopted. The sentiments expressed by the representatives of that province, one reads with sadness, but yet I have no doubt they were largely the sentiments of the people of that province.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It came from an effete Government that would not allow the question to be decided at the polls.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I hope the hon. members of the Administration will listen to the wise sayings of their colleagues :—

"He believed that a protective duty was unjust and could not be supported on true principles. He was also convinced that there was nothing more illogical than that incidental protection which some said was one of the objects of the measure. The object of a tariff was revenue, and in order to protect the manufacturers sufficiently it was necessary to interfere with revenue. * * * He considered it a most unsound principle to diminish the number of articles on the free list. The policy of the country hitherto had been to follow the example of England, &c.

"Was the House ready to subsidize every little enterprise that might be established in this country, without reference to the masses of the people? If it was the wish of the Government to encourage the salt interest artificially, it was better to give it a direct subsidy than to increase the cost of the article by a tax on consumers; and the same argument would apply to the coal of Nova Scotia."

Just as my hon. friend from Ottawa made the observation the other day, which I have no doubt was very correct. The hon. gentleman from Saugeen continued:

"If it is the intention to encourage monopolists at the expense of the people, then let it be done directly out of the consolidated fund, and we would soon know what it would cost.

"Far wiser to subsidize the few monopolists directly out of the public revenues.

"A benefit to a few non-residents—coal mine owners of Nova Scotia—would not be a benefit to the great mass of the people of Nova Scotia. * * The tariff, therefore, so far as it touched salt and coal, was only intended to benefit monopolists to the injury of the great mass of the people.

"The inland shipping of Ontario would also be injuriously affected * * and the result generally injurious to our marine.

"Yet this was called a great "National Policy," which was to protect all interests and please all sections, and lead to the renewal of reciprocity with the United States!"

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It has done all that.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I was not aware of it. It continues—

"What was more absurd than to suppose that an additional taxation of ourselves to the amount of $200,000 was going to have the effect of forcing the Americans to renew free trade with Canada. If true, that a mutual interchange of our products would be the best for both countries, we should receive all that we required from them untaxed, or in other words at the lowest possible rates for ourselves. (hear, hear.)

"What could be more illogical than to say to Americans—"If you will not untax what is consumed by your people, we shall impose a tax on what is consumed by our own."

"If we could make the Americans pay the taxes, then there would be some reason in the arguments of gentlemen opposite; but so long

as we pay them ourselves, there could be nothing advanced in favor of the tariff."

Those, I think, are very sound words.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Whose views are those?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Sir David Macpherson's.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Not the Minister of the Interior, surely!

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The present Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman from Toronto, Mr. Allan, on the same occasion said:—

"He had no desire to see the doctrine of protection revived in Canada, and more duties imposed than were absolutely necessary for the purposes of revenue. He objected to the policy because it would not answer the purpose its promoters claimed for it. He spoke of the great injury that would be done to the shipping and commercial interests of the country.

"He believed the measure was in itself inaugurating a mischievous system of legislation."

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It shows that the logic of facts has changed those gentlemen's minds.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I have also the views of some gentlemen of Nova Scotia, which are equally strong, as well as more forcible and eloquent. I have given the opinions of several prominent individuals. I could go on and give a number more. I could give also the opinions of leading manufacturers of the United States, because they, like the manufacturers of England in 1830, and later on, have come to the conclusion that even they are not benefited by protective duties. They are learning that very much to their cost. We are getting a line of experience in Canada which indicates that the wage earners of the country are being taxed professedly for their benefit, but that even they are injured by the imposition. The Finance Minister, when he makes his Budget Speech, says that a tax, whether levied on one article or another, produces revenue—that if he does not tax cotton wool, sugar, and other things which enter into manufactures, he will have to raise revenue from other articles of consumption. When people pay duties on articles of consumption, like tea, the money goes into the revenue of the country. He does not inform them, however, that when he puts a duty on articles which enter into the manufactures of the country, not only is a revenue derived from them by the Government, but the people are compelled to contribute to the building up of factories for the advancement of factory men and manufacturers, and the result of it is to produce a spasm in trade, and so much competition in some lines that over-production, inflation, bankruptcy and ruin, and all the regular train of results which naturally flow from the cause, are witnessed in the country. The result is that while the revenue is being maintained by taxation, a large portion of the money that the people are compelled to pay does not go into the revenue, but goes temporarily to assist men who are ultimately injured by it. It proves to be an utter failure in its results in a great many cases. As a consequence, the money of the country becomes exhausted, circulation decreases, and results follow which are usually witnessed in all very highly protected countries, and to some extent in all countries, through changes in the nature of trade; so that the expression of opinion from a manufacturer—I do not refer to the opinions expressed by Mr. Hewitt, and others in Congress last year, though they were very pronounced, but another gentleman, whose expressions are of very recent date—will be interesting. Mr. Hewitt is a manufacturer, and he thought the trade policy was a mistake, and would be very glad to inaugurate a very different one; and it is necessary that I should make some reference to American authorities, because I understood some speakers to say that they were a unit there.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—My belief is that if a poll were taken on the question in the United States, the majority of the people would adopt free trade as far as their circumstances would permit.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I will now quote from a report of a speech recently delivered in Detroit:—

A very fine audience assembled at the Detroit Opera House last evening to listen to the address of J. B. Sargent, of New Haven, Conn., upon free trade. The auditorium proper and the dress circle were thronged with people, and the audience overflowed into the gallery. Prominent free traders occupied seats on the platform.

Hon. W. G. Thompson presided and introduced the speaker. He was greeted with applause upon his appearance, and frequently interrupted with cheers. He said:

While the injury from the maintenance of the war tariff to Detroit is in a sense local, the injury to the best business interests of the whole country is general, and has grown to such alarming proportions as to challenge the attention of all. The commercial failures of 1884 exceeded by far in amount those of any previous year. Bradstreet has recently published the result of an investigation of the statistics of unemployed labor in the United States, which shows that there were in December, 1884, 350,000 fewer operatives at work than were employed in 1882, a loss of 14 per cent. The rates of wages are compared with those of 1882, which shows that the industries protected by the highest tariff duties are those in which the heaviest reductions in wages have been made, and that these reductions are generally in proportion to the amount of protection afforded to them. In cotton and woolen mills the reduction has been from 25 to 30 per cent., while there has been no reduction in the wages of the unprotected carpenter, mason, plumber and stone cutter. The reduction of iron-mill workers has been from 15 to 22 per cent., while the pay of butchers, bakers, millers, tanners and printers, has not declined at all, thus emphatically controverting the proposition that a high tariff makes high wages for the workingman.

John Bright, in a letter written the 12th of last March, says the price of labor in England has advanced fifty per cent. since the free trade movement commenced there, while the hours of labor in many trades have been reduced.

The tariff has destroyed the foreign carrying trade of the United States; our flag has disappeared from the ocean. We pay a tribute of not less than $400,000,000 annually to foreign vessels and are supporting 100,000 British sailors, every one of whom would be an enemy in time of war.

The tariff prohibits imports that might purchase the products of American labor. It has cut down the sale of American manufactures at home and abroad and depleted the returns of American agriculture, an industry followed by more than half of our people. It has given the absolute control of the commerce of Canada, Mexico and the republics of Central and South America—countries which by reason of their contiguity we might easily control—to trans-Atlantic nations.

This is interesting to me, as showing the course of things in protected countries, and proving that even in the United States they are subject to the same difficulties that we find here.

HON. MR. PLUMB—And in England, too.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Mr. J. B. Sargent then addressed the meeting and said:—

I was born into a manufacturing family and in a manufacturing community. The settled policy of the whole civilized world then was to collect the revenue for the support of governments largely through taxes on imports, under the claim that it was protecting manufactures, and that the revenue really came from the foreign manufacturers or producers--a scheme of tyrants to get from the people more money than the people would have been willing to pay by any kind of direct taxation. I became familiar with manufacturing life in the manufacturing village of my birthplace, near which were factories for the manufacture of cotton and woolen goods, the operators being nearly all immigrants from the manufacturing districts of England. The manufacture of supplies for cotton and woolen mills was the business that I, in part, inherited from my father. I well remember the discussions of manufacturing and business men in my boyhood days concerning the hazards of the manufacture of woolen goods, the sales of which were confined to the one market—the United States. The course of the business was often described, and it ran like this: The manufacturers started with their business in good times and with only a moderate capital, because wealthy manufacturers were scare and interest high, and loans to manufacturers were hazardous.

Business would be brisk for about three years from the previous hard times, and by that time the market was fully supplied and sales became few. It was expensive for the manufacturers to stop, and therefore they got all the advances they could from their commission merchants. Then, sales were made at a reduced price to force the goods upon the market, then reduction of wages, then short time, then suspension of work, then failure and bankruptcy. The villagers were almost dead for about three years till the overstocked market became bare of goods. Then the mills, under a new owner, were repaired. The card clothing and delicate parts of the machinery that had been spoiled by inactivity and rust were replaced with new. Workmen were gathered into the mills and manufacturing was started with a rush again; and after about three years of business prosperity the dullness of an overstocked market came again, and then the failures.

I was raised in business as a merchant in the dry goods business in Boston, and went to Georgia as a merchant in 1843, that is more than forty years ago. My teachings on

the tariff question were of the highly protective doctrines of the manufacturers of Massachusetts in the comparative infancy of manufactures, and the same doctrines as so fully set forth in the New York *Tribune*. In 1849, I sold out my business in Georgia and removed to New York, and in 1850, became a manufacturer in Massachusetts, with a store in New York for the sale of my goods.

I had noticed how busy and prosperous were the manufacturers and people of England since the adoption of free the trade policy there. I had noticed that the English-born operators of the cotton and woollen mills of my earlier days were missing, and their places filled with the people from other countries.

I had noticed that emigration, since some time prior to the war, had been very little from the factory work-people from free-trade England, and large from high-tariff Germany; that there was almost universal content in free-trade England, and almost universal discontent in all the high-tariff countries of the continent of Europe. The more I thought upon the subject, the more I could not see why the people should be much interested in paying us manufacturers from 35 to 100 per cent. more for goods made by us, than the foreign price—especially as the great West and South could pay in exports of produce of their own raising. I knew that free-trade England was our severest competitor; but I also knew that we got but very littte emigration from the manufacturing districts of England, compared with that from the manufacturing districts of high-tariff Germany. That looked as though the "pauperism" was in the high-tariff country rather than in the free-trade country. I concluded to investigate in Europe for myself. I spent four months of each of the years 1873 and 1875 in Europe, and looked up the protective theory with my own eyes, in the light of my own experience and observation as a merchant, and especially as a manufacturer. I became thoroughly convinced that instead of my having been for so many years a genteel and aristocratic pauper, living and prospering upon the charities of the people, I really had been one of the deluded and oppressed victims of the Pennsylvania, Ohio and Lake Superior coal and metal oligarchies, who, in order to pile up illegitimate wealth, had so managed Congress as to acquire, through high tariffs, substantially a monopoly of supplying us with coal and metals, and at a price very largely in excess of the prices paid by our foreign competitors. But in order to increase the demand for their coal and metals—not that they care anything for the manufacturers' good, only so far as we can be used to enrich them—they rob us manufacturers at wholesale, and allow us to rob the people at retail. They take over sixty per cent. on pig-iron from us foundrymen, and allow us to rob the buyers of our hardware from twenty-five to forty-five per cent., whenever we can combiue to keep up prices, so that they feel tolerably secure in their monopoly of supplying the metal in nearly all the hardware and machinery used in this country. I found that our woolen goods manufacturers sustain about the same relations with the wool growers that the metal goods manufacturers do with the producers of metals. The wool growers rob the manufacturers of woollen goods and permit the woollen goods manufacturers to rob the people.

Provided the mannfacturers were relieved from the tariff on raw materials, they would need no protection on their manufactures and would be able to relieve the people engaged in other employments from contributing to their maintenance and protection through forced tributes by means of high tariffs on importations.

What the manufacturers need is simply to be let alone, and be left, each for himself, to work out his own success or go under. They do not need any favors through tariffs for protection nor through tariffs for revenue, if relieved from the burdens of tariff on their materials.

Who are the workers for wages in this country? Of what are they composed? First, of the native stock, originally coming largely from the Puritans of the Anglo-Saxon race, ready to dare and do anything for success, willing to undergo any hardship and suffer any privation on the road to success, and compelled to use to the full extent all their powers of mind and body in trying to exist and improve their condition. Other, and allied races, but with somewhat different characteristics, came at the same time and soon afterwards, nearly all in vigorous condition of body and mind, and all imbued with the determination of achieving success. Their descendants are what we call our native stock.

They constitute a sort of reservoir of force and a balance wheel and regulator in factory labor. As inventors and mechanics they are nowhere excelled. They know how to succeed and need no protection. Later, partly as the cause and partly as the effect of our great increase in agriculture and manufactures, internal improvements and inter-state commerce, we have added to and made a part of our working force an immense immigration of the same and of somewhat different races. Much of this immigration has been converted into workshop and factory labor. We have largely the Irish race in all its various characteristics. Much of it crude, but muscular, honest and ambitious. That race has well done its share of the hard labor. The Irish race is a large and almost indispensable element in American factory labor.

The German race, often dissatisfied or irrepressible at home, hard worked on a poor soil, or unskilfully managed in factory labor, for years of their early manhood forced into the army, their labor always largely reduced in the fruits to them by the taxes necessary to support royalty, nobility, and standing armies; has come to us bountifully and in increasing numbers since the high German tariff on raw materials of 1879. In the years 1875-9 there landed in the United States

120,919 German immigrants. In the years 1880-4 920,215 were landed. The Danes and Swedes have added largely to our working force. This admixture of the most vigorous, intelligent and ambitious of the workers of all other civilized nations with our own native stock, and by the skilful management of employers combined into one harmonious and homogeneous whole, has produced a working force nowhere equalled for intelligence, skill, industry, willing endurance and ambition. There is no tariff on imports of European labor and never can be. Here every workingman knows he is a part and parcel of the community in which he resides, and of the nation, with equal rights to advise, and help direct in the local and national welfare. He can take a part in deciding who are to make or change the laws. He can take a part in deciding the amount of revenue to be collected and in indicating the purposes for which it shall be expended. He can take a part in shaping the policy in regard to educational and religious questions, and in all these matters he knows that his vote is as weighty as that of any man. He knows that all avenues leading to education, to wealth, to high social, civil or military positions, are as open to him as to the proudest in the land. * * * Farming in this country is the great regulator of the rate of wages. Factory wages will not long remain below what can be earned on the cheap and fertile lands of the great and seemingly ever increasing West. Employers of mining or factory labor may cut down wages and hold them down temporarily in dull times, but soon so many will go to farms of their own, or to farms owned by others, that the ranks of the factory worker will be so thinned out that wages will return to or above their normal rate. Till our lands are all occupied in farms and worn out, till our forests cease to grow, till our mines are exhausted, till intelligence ceases in the land and the people cease to rule, labor in this country will enjoy advantages over European labor so long as Europe remains politically and socially as now. Labor here needs no protection and gets none.

Of European labor with which American labor would have, under free trade, to compete, Mr. Sargent said, it was physically inferior by reasons of wars and immigration; European climate, in the manufacturing belt, is not so favorable; there is no land held by the poor, and European workmen are kept on scanty subsistence, of necessity, because wages are low. These are the competitors that protectionists warn American laborers against. They warn giants against trials of strength with pigmies. I would rather have one average immigrant worker from continental Europe, after being combined into our American labor-force and practiced in our methods, paid with our pay, fed with our food, and filled with our freedom, than an average three of those who remain there under all conditions in which they exist, and will exist, probably, for many generations. We can afford to pay them here twice as much per day as they got at home, and then get rich out of their labor, provided we can have raw materials, free of duty, to enable us to sell our surplus merchandise in the non-manufactuaing countries of the world.

The pauper labor of high-tariff continental Europe may need protection from us. We do not from it. There are other classes of inferiority in the quantity and quality of the product of labor in Europe. The management there is less energetic and less exacting; work is not pushed forward with so much zeal and constancy, and more resting time is taken during the hours of employment. The condition and efficiency of labor in England are much better than on the continent. Many causes that stimulate it here, do so there. Wages are thirty to sixty per cent. higher per day than on the continent, and workmen do more and better work, making them cheaper to their employers than on the continent.

This is the opinion of a disinterested manufacturer in the United States, a very intelligent gentlemen living in a country where information is so generally diffused. He has examined carefully the condition of the laboring classes in Europe; he was a master mechanic himself, and his conclusion is that not only are the English workmen better fed, but the wages paid in England are higher.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Higher than in the United States?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am speaking of wages in Europe, and the hon. gentlemen who is clear headed certainly ought to follow the line of my argument. Mr. Sargent continues:—

"In some departments, we are hardly up to the English in cheapness and quality of machinery and in economy of management. But free trade in iron and textiles would remedy both these. American factory labor produces more in proportion to the wages paid it than any other factory labor in the world."

Mr. Sargent then discussed the common fallacy that low wages are cheap wages. He then turned to the wool tariff, of which he said:—

The wool raisers with their high tariffs, averaging on clothing and combing wools over fifty per cent., repress the manufacture of the better qualities of woolen goods, by prohibiting the importation of the better and necessary wools of Australia, except at more than fifty per cent. higher price to the American manufacturers than the English or Belgium manufacturers pay for them. The American manufacturers would use only a portion of Australian wool in their mixture,

sufficient only to give the necessary strength, elasticity and softness ; but the selfish and short-sighted American wool growers try to arbitrarily prohibit the importation of Australian wools, and thus they lose the opportunity to supply any of the wool used in the manufacture of most of the good woolens worn in this country. Because of the lack of Australian wool or its equivalent here, at a reasonable price, most of our better woolens are made in Europe, and imported here. Yet the wool growers pay no higher wages to the little human help necessary to raise wool than the same or any other farmer pays to those who help him raise wheat or corn or hogs. The protection that the wool tariff at first gave to the wool growers, caused them to be independent and negligent in the feed, shelter and care of their sheep. The breeds and their wool deteriorated, and east of the Mississippi river, the number of sheep has steadily decreased since soon after the adoption of the high tariff of 1856. The state of Michigan had 4,028,707 sheep in 1867; in 1882, only 2,320,752. It is not always the robber class that is the most prosperous in the long run. The wool growers with their high tariffs, may be compared to the average easy-going young man born with a silver spoon in his mouth—often an unfortunate circumstance that does not prompt to any energetic effort except to get more of the spoon. The wool-growers instead of improving their breeds of sheep—as the free-trade Australians are obliged to do—are now banding together for more of the tariff spoon. They want more pay for the sheep's labor in walking about and eating grass. There is certainly very little human labor in growing wool. * * * Michigan has gained little if anything by the high tariff on wool, but she has lost her natural position as a great commercial state by forced disuse, under tariff conditions. The great lakes that almost surround her are but little more of value to her now than a Chinese wall. In consequence of tariff protection, commerce, except with the States, is substantially barred out. Free-trade, that has made this country what it is (I mean absolute free-trade among the States), is only at the south and west of Michigan. If good when coming from the south and west why not from the north and east—from Canada?"

Mr. Sargent touched upon a number of other protected industries, treating them in an equally forcible manner. He then gave a history of free trade in England, and concluded as follows :—

England's foreign trade (exports and imports) increased, in the first twenty-five years of free trade, from $30 per each inhabitant of England to $90; an increase of three-fold. The foreign trade of the United States is now almost exactly, per inhabitant, what England was, per inhabitant, at the beginning of free trade. Ours is $30 per inhabitant, including exports of breadstuffs, provisions of all kinds, cotton and petroleum, and all exports and imports. Manufactures increased five-fold. Prior to the passage of any tariff-reform measures in England, the working population were kept so much in idleness, and their earnings were so small and irregular that there was much suffering, among even the able-bodied, temperate and frugal, from the want of the bare necessaries of life, which were kept at a high price by protective tariffs. But the circumstances of the workingmen were gradually but rapidly improved by the tariff reform measures; and at the end of the first twenty-five years the yearly earnings doubled, and the cost of a better living had decreased to half what the poor living had cost twenty-five years previous. Pauperism had diminished more than half. Convictions for crime had diminished from one in 800 to one in 1,800 of the inhabitants per year. Under free trade in vessels and navigation, the merchant marine increased in tonnage a million tons, and changed largely from sails to steam. Education has kept pace with the material prosperity of the people. England has no advantages over us except in the enlightenment of her statesmen. We have many natural advantages over her which we suppress by high tariffs. We are able to cope with England in manufacture and commerce, if on the same free trade basis, and would get our share of the present commerce of the world, and of its enormous increase under a rivalry between the two nations.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—These are the opinions of Mr. J. B. Sargent.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Who is J. B. Sargent?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—He is a prominent manufacturer in the United States who addressed an audience in Detroit the other day. The hon. gentleman must know where Detroit is?

HON. MR. PLUMB—Yes, I know where Detroit is, but I do not know who Mr. Sargent is.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—He is a manufacturer, and expressed his ideas very clearly and to the point, and I am sure that they cannot be controverted by the hon. gentleman from Niagara. I have produced facts here in the same line with those referred to by Mr. Sargent, as to the trade relations of the different countries ; as to the expressions of opinion of prominent men, and as to deposits in savings banks not being evidence of prosper-

ity in the country, and I have adduced the best possible proof of the position I have taken, and I think the hon. gentleman from Niagara will find it very difficult to controvert my statements, or the statements of that Detroit manufacturer. To show that there is not very much in the arguments of my hon. friends, who give as a reason why English statesmen were induced to adopt a free-trade policy, that the country had grown rich under a protective policy, I refer to Molesworth's history of England, vol. 1, page 51.

HON MR. KAULBACH—We do not want any book theories.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Am I not permitted to refer to history, to the standard authors? This historian remarks:

"Nor were these discontents without reason. The people of this country had for some time past been suffering cruelly, and had been forcing themselves on the attention of their law-givers in an altogether unpleasant and unsatisfactory manner. Statements of agricultural distress, mining distress, and manufacturing distress, were made, echoed and re-echoed. Sometimes they were met by unqualified assent; sometimes by vehement contradiction; but still they continued to be made. But let Governments and members of Parliament say what they would, there was distress, and very serious and terrible distress, too. Agricultural laborers were found starved to death, having tried in vain to support nature with sorrel and other such like food. In vain did landlords abate their rents, and clergymen their tithes; wages continued to fall, and had at length reached such a point of depression that they did not suffice to support existence."

"The simple fact was, that wars, national debt, increase of population, corn-laws, maladministration of the poor-laws and other legislation or hindrance of legislation, had reduced the great mass of the people, and especially the agricultural laborers, to the verge of starvation and despair. They were going mad with misery; and in their madness they did mischief by which they themselves were sure to be the first and greatest sufferers."

That shows—

HON. MR. PLUMB—What does it show? That the condition of the agricultural classes of England was exceedingly distressing.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I can show by history that the statements that hon. gentlemen have made, as to the cause of England adopting free-trade, are not correct.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—That is fifty-five years ago.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend seems to take a melancholy pleasure in reading of this distress.

HON. MR. POWER—I rise to a question of order. There are not more than a dozen members on this side of the House, and there are some sixty on the other side, and although hon. gentlemen on the other side are allowed, as a rule, to go on without interruption, when three or four members speak on this side they are interrupted continuously, and in a most discourteous way.

THE SPEAKER—With regard to the point of order raised by the hon. gentleman from Halifax, the hon. member who has the floor has taken it so good-naturedly that I did not care to interfere; had he complained of it, I certainly should have called hon. members to order.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I do not think my hon. friend from Halifax has any right to say that those interruptions are discourteous, so long as my hon. friend from Hopewell has not complained.

HON. MR. PLUMB—When we ask questions we do so to get information. If my young friend, the senior member for Halifax, had been in some other body, he would have been taught something on rules of order.

THE SPEAKER—These remarks are certainly out of order.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—It must be remembered that there are very few in this Chamber who advocate the views which I hold, and of course it can scarcely be considered that all public men must think alike on this subject. This question was not imported into this House by the Opposition, but by a supporter of the Government, and in the discussion hon. gentlemen have gone too freely into the subject.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I did not read from a book.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I will remind my hon. friend of a story that I have read, of a scene down in the eastern country. It was that of an unfortunate fellow who was up on a charge for murder, and who had employed a lawyer of some local celebrity to defend him. After the lawyer had spoken for six hours in defence of his client, the prisoner became weary, and asked his counsel how long he intended to continue his address. The lawyer replied that he was going on for five hours longer, when his client was ready to exclaim, with King Lear, "oh, torture me no more, I will confess!"—he offered that if his lawyer would stop the argument he would acknowledge his crime. The poor culprit had to undergo the punishment of eleven hours speaking, and suffered capital punishment in the end. I was reminded of that story the other day, after the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg had reached the fourth or fifth day of his remarks. I had hoped that the same effect would be produced here—that the Government would have admitted the enormity of their policy, and would have thrown themselves upon the mercy of the country, if the hon, gentleman would discontinue his address.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We will now, if the hon. gentleman will give up the five hours.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I admit that there might be some application of the story if I were to go on for five days. But I am not defending the government in this case. I stumbled upon the *Contemporary Review* the other day, and—

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Another book?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Yes, another book, and I am sure that the opinions expressed by the writer here are very much more forcibly put than any remarks I can make. It is a lot of tabulated information.

HON. MR. DEVER—I think the hon. gentleman has a right to be respected; he speaks "by the book."

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Yes, I am very much obliged to my hon. friend. I have heard it running through the speeches of hon. gentlemen on the other side from the beginning—through the speeches of the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg, the hon. gentleman from Quinte, the hon. gentleman from Hamilton, the hon. gentleman from Belleville, and, I think, the senior member from Belleville, particularly, told us, in advocating the high protective system, about the cheapness of goods, leaving people to infer that the very cheapness of the goods to-day was the result of the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen who use that line of argument in their addresses, certainly are not complimenting the intelligence of the people whom they expect to read their speeches, when they suppose that that will be a forcible argument, or that the people will not be able to see through the flimsiness of such statements, as having any bearing at all upon the issue, and hence I would refer here to the reasons—to the great reduction of rates, in the old countries, upon articles of consumption, and the reasons for that reduction of rates. The author of the article I refer to was Mr. Fowler, M. P., and he compiles these figures from a legitimate channel. He says:—"A comparison in figures of the prices as given in this table, and of the prices of the same articles six years later, will bring before the reader the present situation more impressively than any other mode of statement. It will suffice to give the most important article of commerce—prices in Jauuary, 1879, and in January, 1885:

	1879.	Jan. 1884.	Jan. 1885.
Coffee, per cwt. (Ceylon)	65s.	70s.	57s. 6d.
Coals, per ton.....	19s.	17s.	17s. 6d.
Wheat, per qr.....	39s. 7d.	39s.	32s. 6d.
Sugar, per cwt. (W. India)...	17s to 20s.	16s. to 19s.	9s. 6d. to 12s.

And yet the inference would be that the cheap rates of sugar in Canada now all comes about through the National Policy—that is if the hon. gentleman's speeches are to be considered of any importance. He goes on to discuss the reasons of those enormous reductions, and

among other reasons he shows the difference in rates of freights, which is certainly enormous. He gives the rates from Chicago to New York as follows :—

AVERAGE FREIGHT OF WHEAT FROM CHICAGO TO NEW YORK.

Year.	By Lake and Channel.	By Lake and Rail.	By All Rail.
1868....	24.54	29.	42.6
1873....	19.19	26.9	33.2
1879....	11.60	13.3	17.3
1880	12.27	15.7	19.7
1881	8.19	10.4	14.4
1882	7.89	10.9	14.6
1883	8.40	11.5	16.5
1884 Jan. to Sept.	6.60	9.75	13.

The charges as to shipping are equally remarkable. Freights for wheat sent from New York and San Francisco to England fell 50 per cent. between October, 1883, and October, 1884. They have also fallen heavily between India and the United Kingdom. Since 1880, it would be safe to say that freights have fallen generally from 30 to 40 per cent. The following rates were given last year from Calcutta to the United Kingdom :

	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.
Via the Cape, Wheat,	62s 6d	30s	25s	20s 6d
Via the Canal "	71s 3d	35s	26s 3d	17s 6d

HON. MR. KAULBACH—That shows the depression of trade in England.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—It shows the remarkable reduction in the cost of transportation in the great productions of the world which are required for consumption, and it is no wonder, therefore, with such largely diminished freight rates, and such reduction in prices in the beginning, that many of our staple commodities should run so exceeding low. Hon. gentlemen may think it very absurd of me to allude to such a reason as that, because the people ought to understand it ; yet hon. gentlemen will seriously persist in uttering such speeches, which are only calculated, if they are meant for anything, to mislead the people and teach them that under a high protective tariff the prices of sugar, cotton, and agricultural implements are lower. There is a tendency of that kind going on continually in the world, owing largely to the introduction of improved machinery and new appliances by which commodities can be grown, and produced, and transported more cheaply than in previous years ; hence it is natural enough that they should be purchased at lower rates.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Competition in trade has done that.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I have given the opinions of some of our public men on this question, and I would now suggest an adjournment of the debate before going into the other branch of the subject.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said he would prefer that the debate should be continued after six o'clock.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—I understood the hon. member to say that one effect of the depression in New Brunswick, is that the attendance of school children in the public schools has diminished, and I remarked in a low tone of voice, that it was not so in the province of Quebec ; to which the hon gentleman replied by quoting from a copy of the Montreal *Witness*, in which the rates for municipal taxation are shown to be lower than the rates set forth in the census, in which there was no taxation. I am going to prove that I am right in saying that such was not the case in the province of Quebec. I hold in my hand a copy of the report of the Inspector of Public Schools for the province of Quebec, for the year 1883-84.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I did not refer to the province of Quebec in my remark as to school returns. I referred to the *Witness*, and to the Deputy Registrar's report.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—The hon. gentleman showed me a paper, and I took it as an answer by him to my remark. Here is what the report of the Inspector says. I will take a comparison from the year 1881 :—

	Pupils on the School Rolls.	Average Attendance	Increase of School Sec's
1881-82	236,699	180,463	501
1882-83	242,723	185,892	424
1883-84	250,000	192,852	110

showing an increase every year. The same remark applies to the number of schools ; the last increase was 110, there-

fore the hon. gentleman was not right in saying that in Quebec there was a decrease in the school attendance as well as in New Brunswick.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I did not refer to the school attendance in Quebec, as I had no returns.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (31), "An Act amend and consolidate the Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883 and 1884." (Sir Alex. Campbell).

Bill (61), "An Act to further to amend the Acts incorporating the Richelieu Navigation Company, and the Richelieu & Ontario Navigation Company." (Mr. Pelletier).

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN resumed his speech. He said: I cannot close the remarks which I have felt called upon to make upon this important question, after hearing so many eloquent addresses, without making a few observations in reply to the remarks which fell from the hon. member from Lunenburg. The hon. gentleman in the course of his speech, made the following among other observations:—

"Depression exists, but prosperity generally abounds.

"The exports from the farms and fisheries have largely increased, and factories have been developed.

"The taxes are not imposed on the necessaries of life, but on the luxuries, and the masses do not feel them. They are no burden on the people.

"The people of England are suffering from a free-trade policy, and rushing in thousands to the United States.

"Savings banks deposits show faith in the Government.

"A reciprocity treaty would be of questionable advantage.

"The West Indies trade has been largely promoted by the National Policy, and our ships have been employed.

"The fishermen and all industrial classes are less taxed than ever before.

"The increased imports are due to the National Policy.

"Coal is cheaper to the consumer.

"The fisheries have been developed by the National Policy.

"No necessaries of life are dearer; but rents, meats, and farm produce are higher, &c.

I recapitulate those in order to give hon. gentlemen a general notion of what the remarks are. My hon. friend says that "depression exists, but prosperity abounds." The meaning of that I do not exactly understand.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I will explain it if my hon. friend wishes.

HON. MR. MCLELAN—I remember the apostle Paul spoke of knowing how to be abased and how to abound, but I fancy he did not wish the Phillippians to understand that he was both hungry and full at the same time; and therefore the address which my hon. friend makes to the Canadians must have a different signification. He says the exports of the farms and fisheries have largely increased, and the factories have developed. By the exports from the farms, I fancy he means the exports of cattle, to a large extent. I cannot conceive why hon. gentlemen should allude to these exports as being influenced by the protective tariff. The products of the field are the mainstay of the country undoubtedly; only for that the effect of the National Policy would be more disastrous than it has been. They are not favored by the National Policy, and neither is lumber. The Finance Minister said, in one of his speeches, that it was impossible to aid the lumber trade; hence there is no possibility that any argument can be made out of the increased exports of lumber and farm produce in support of the protective system. One cannot see how the National Policy would make a large catch of fish.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—By the protection of our fisheries.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—One cannot see how the fisheries could be made more productive by high taxation. I am surprised that these things should go forth from this hon. body as the matured sentiments of the hon. Senator. They must be misleading, or they cannot possibly be recognized as arguments on the question presented to us for discussion. He says that the taxes are not imposed on the necessaries of life, but on the luxuries,

and the masses do not feel them, and they are no burdens on the people. He says the fishermen and all industrial classes are less taxed than they ever were before. The fishermen's needs (meaning, I suppose, the requirements of their industries) are not taxed.

My hon. friend from Lunenburg dwelt very considerably on the favor with which the Government had dealt with the fisheries under the National Policy. The bounty system is not part of the protective tariff at all. I fancy that that boon was given to the fishermen largely because of their share of the fisheries award, and no doubt in that way it was some benefit to them. But if given to them as compensation for the losses they sustain under the high protective tariff, they are not at all recompensed, and I question whether it is a fair compensation for their share of the award. So, taking it either way, they are scarcely recompensed by the small bounty which they have been in the habit of receiving. I have been favored with letters from fishermen in Grand Manan, and I hope I will be pardoned for giving the expressions of practical men rather than my own opinions on these subjects, because those engaged in those departments of trade know more on subjects with which they have to deal than we can know, and when the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg rises in this Chamber, and says that the fishermen are more contented because their requirements for the fishing industry are not subject to taxation, and also from the consideration and favor shown to them, I am satisfied that he does not speak the sentiments of the fishermen of Lunenburg.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I have a large interest in the industry myself.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has and finds it remunerative, so far as he is concerned; but if these correspondents are correct, there must be some discrepancy between his views and theirs. These correspondents are reliable, respectable fishermen. I will read an extract from a letter from one of them, dated Grand Manan, February 22, 1885 :—

"As regards the tariff, no one can say there is one redeeming feature in it, as regards the fishing interests—excepting fish-hooks, lines and nets, as they come from the machines—the duty on everything else the fisherman uses has been gradually increased in almost every case. Lines, nets and hooks, if duty was 25 to 35 per cent., would not add a great deal more to the burden, as the cost of them is very small now-a-days. The poorest fisherman, the one who needs it most, gets somewhere about $2.60 bounty from our Government; the one rich enough to own vessels gets more, of course. The man getting $2.60 will wear out two pairs of rubber boots in the year, at least, and more if he fishes in the winter, which cost in the States $3.50; duty 25 per cent., making 87½ cents; traders' 20 per cent. profit on cost, 17½ cents more, makes the boots cost the fisherman $1.05 per pair more than they should, which, if he uses two pairs of boots only, will leave him 50 cents out of his $2.60 so kindly given him by the paternal Government. Three gallons of kerosene oil will swallow up the rest, by the increased cost from the effects of duty on it. Then he stands square with the Government. After that, all the rest is one way—the manilla cordage, sails for his boat, pork, lard, etc. There is no use enumerating. Everything he uses is increased in cost by the protective tariff, whether made abroad or at home.

"It is a Government that evidently is trying to conciliate the proprietor of what they expect will be their home in the next world, as they tax Bibles and prayer-books, and admit Brimstone free.

"The incorrigible Sabbath-school scholar, if he persists in it, must pay 30 per cent. on the cards he or she uses: but the meek and holy gambler, the devotional whist and euchre player (if he buys a bang-up article), only pays from 6 to 12 per cent. for his cards. Thoughtful fathers of our country! On free list are: Fish-hooks and diamonds, agates and fish-nets, emeralds and cod-lines, rubies, pearls, sapphires, garnets, and pure-bred dogs; opals, fur-skins—but not oilskin clothing for the poor mariner. But I won't enumerate further.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Why does he not buy his rubber boots in Canada, where he can get them cheaper?

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Canvas and duck are manufactured at Yarmouth, in Nova Scotia.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am surprised that my hon. friend would take up the time of the House reading such nonsense as that letter contains.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I will read another letter which perhaps will be more pleasing to my hon. friend. This is dated 17th February 1885 :—

"You ask how the bounty works? Now it works well enough for those it suits. I was always opposed to it. Where do you think the benefit is in giving a boat fisherman two dollars bounty for fishing all the season in a boat, clad in oil clothes and rubber boots, the duty on which will cost him at least five dollars for the year's work. You may say buy Canadian goods—that is where the shoe pinches. They are made and sold under Government protection, consequently poor goods sold at a profit. If they had to depend on the *quality* to sell them, better goods would be made. The sum of $1 per ton helps very little on a bad voyage—a good trip does not need it. Government had better spend bounty in providing boat shelters, coast improvements, &c."

Now, if the fisherman of Lunenburgh, about whom the hon. gentleman speaks so freely, are as intelligent as these—they will, without doubt, come to the same conclusion, and will feel surprised to find themselves so misrepresented by the Hon. Senator in this Parliament. I refer to those letters in answer to what the hon. gentleman has said with reference to the fishermen being remunerated for all their taxes. Then the hon. gentleman asks what benefit has the Dominion gained by the expenditure of the present Government in the way of aiding emigration? This is a very pertinent question which he does not answer himself, and no one else does. This country, in my judgment, has gained nothing, but the United States has gained. It has to a large extent done more harm than good; It has provided for a lot of Government favorites and there has been a large expenditure, considerably over half a million of dollars, and I should like to ask the question which the hon. member from Lunenburg has asked—what possible benefit has the Dominion gained by it? The savings bank deposits have already been referred to. Then the hon. gentleman says reciprocity treaties are questionable advantages. My hon. friend knows very well that that was one of the professed objects of the Premier in inaugurating the National Policy. It was advocated chiefly on that basis. I am sure my hon. friend knows that that was one of the arguments used in favor of the National Policy.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—In what way?

HON. MR. PLUMB—You are mistaken in saying that the National Policy was advocated on the basis of reciprocity.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman is mistaken when he says it was not.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I know what I am talking about.

HON. MR. POWER—I doubt it.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I will read a resolution which was adopted in the House of Commons, in 1877:—Moved by Sir J. A. Macdonald,—

"That the Speaker do not leave the chair, but that it be resolved that this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen, now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and, moving, as it ought to do, in the direction of reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade."

HON. MR. PLUMB—Through a reciprocity of tariffs.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The hon. gentleman from Niagara must understand that, while his ability is recognized, his memory is not always above reproach. It is sometimes defective—notably so in this instance—and like other people, he has his failings, and therefore, I think he might let me proceed. But my hon. friend from Lunenburg differs from his Premier and from almost all the gentlemen in the Lower Provinces of his political stripe, that I have heard discuss this question of protection. Almost all of them have assured our people—the farmer and others who are interested in this reciprocal trade, and who are exceedingly anxious, I may say, to secure reciprocal trade relations with the United States, if possible, on reasonably fair terms—on every occasion I have heard them claim for this National

Policy, that it was devised to bring about that state of things, but it has not brought about reciprocity.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I never advocated to the contrary.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I have never had the pleasure of listening to the hon. gentleman on the stump, and consequently I do not venture to contradict him. I simply say that the opinion to which he has given expression is different to that entertained by his party, and differs entirely from that of another distinguished gentleman, Sir Alex. Galt, and entirely from the opinions of those who have changed from free-trade to protection. All of them advocate, so far as I know, a reciprocity treaty, and therefore the opinions expressed by my hon. friend from Lunenburg are exceptional. I hope his opinions will not prevail. There is nothing visible on the surface of anything being done during the last six years to procure this boon which is foreshadowed in this resolution, but I do trust that in future some steps will be taken. We see every evidence in the case of negotiations favoring Newfoundland, which is unfettered by this Confederacy, that Mr. Bayard, one of the Cabinet Ministers at Washington, is quite in accord with that view of things, that closer trade relations should exist with bordering countries, and in fact, according to Sir Ambrose Shea, he indicated that while the Government were prepared to consider the question, they preferred considering it in its relations to the whole British dominions on this continent.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Sir Ambrose Shea was not acting for the Newfoundland Government.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I have not said that he was.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—That was the impression conveyed to the House.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I am giving his expression of opinion in favor of negotiating reciprocal trade relations towards which we are all so favorable.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Have not our Governments given intimations that they are ready for a reciprocity treaty?

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—They may have given a great many intimations of their readiness, but I do not see many results from it. Another observation was that the West India trade was largely developed by the National Policy, and that our ships are more employed, and my hon. friend repeated it several times in order to give it more emphasis. I feel inclined to take issue with him as to the correctness of his statements. As far as I have heard from that province, I would come to the conclusion that the West India trade of Halifax is greatly impaired by the National Policy.

HON. MR. POWER—It is ruined.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—The hon gentleman from Lunenburg then refers to the fishermen, to which reference I have replied. He says Halifax is prosperous, and has largely increased its exports; that coal is cheaper to the consumer. That was not the argument used by the gentlemen from Nova Scotia in 1870, a number of whose speeches I did not quote from to-day; some of them unfortunately have departed from us, and others are yet in this Chamber. That is not the argument of Sir Alexander Galt. That is not the statement, as far as I know, of anyone else who discusses these trade questions. I think the hon. gentlemen who represent the city of St. John would be able to throw some light on the question, whether the duty has increased the price of coal. I think the people of New Brunswick have some reason to feel that their taxes are very considerably increased in consequence of the amount of coal they are obliged to use that is increased by the additional duty. And then my hon. friend says that no necessaries of life are dearer, but meat and farm produce are cheaper. His argument is peculiar in this way; that one end of his sentence differs from the other, and therefore one end of it must always be right. Then he goes on to say, on several occasions, that bread is not dearer at all—that the duty on flour and corn meal does not tend to make any difference in the price.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I did not say corn meal.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—My hon. friend said that bread was not made any dearer by the tax on flour.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Your leader in this House took the same view, in a speech which he made a few days previous to mine.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I have not observed it. I differ altogether from my hon. friends, and I differ from the Minister of Finance, and I think the Minister of Finance differs from both of us, because he admitted in his speech of last year, and his speech of the year before, that the duty did increase the cost of flour, but only in a limited way.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The hon. member from Ottawa thought differently.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I have not been able to find any statement of that kind from him ; but from my own experience—and I have been somewhat connected with the flour business—I know that the effect it has on flour is very peculiar. There are generally two or three periods in the year when we can buy very much cheaper than at other times. There is a drop in the price of flour, and having a class of small vessels running, we can buy flour cheaper in New York than in Canada. The effect of this duty is to remove from us largely that option, or, if it does not deprive us of it, we are taxed more by having to pay the duty.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—If you get the flour in Canada, you have no duty to pay on it. You can get Canada flour in the United States.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—But we are virtually compelled to pay duty on imports.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—No.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I have a statement in my hand showing the duty collected on flour, corn meal, etc., at different ports in the Maritime Provinces.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Separate the flour.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I will separate it ; the statement is as follows :—

DUTY COLLECTED on Indian Corn, Corn Meal and Wheat Flour, 30th June to December 31, 1884.

PORTS.	INDIAN CORN.	CORN MEAL.	WHEAT FLOUR.
Amherst	$ 15 90	$ 232 00	$ 338 50
Annapolis	12 45	786 60	1,288 50
Antigonish	.....	186 00	87 50
Anchat	.....	180 40	860 00
Baddeck	.....	16 80	145 00
Barrington	83	513 80	1,693 65
Bridgetown	2 41	110 00	347 00
Cornwallis	3 38	384 00	1,257 60
Digby	7 50	729 00	709 25
Guysboro	.....	78 20	334 50
Halifax	4,268 90	1,475 20	6,876 50
Liverpool	1 05	994 80	1,637 00
Lockeport	2 55	562 80	801 50
Londonderry	15 00	231 60	605 00
Lunenburg	.....	1,422 40	2,919 00
Margaretville	.....	42 00	301 75
North Sydney	.....	787 60	1,907 50
Parrsborough	15 30	526 00	413 00
Pictou	.....	431 60	406 50
Port Hawkesbury	.....	168 00	1,103 50
Port Hood	.....	.....	5 50
Hort Medway	.....	43 60	114 00
Shelburne	68	284 80	631 00
Sydney	.....	455 20	653 50
Truro	.....	230 00	653 50
Weymouth	2 78	1,592 80	2,062 50
Windsor	90	1,442 80	2,428 75
Yarmouth	25 50	3,799 20	4,160 50
	$4,375 05	$17,707 20	$34,088 50

Wheat Flour	$34,088 50
Corn Meal	17,707 20
Indian Corn	4,375 05
	$56,170 75

Therefore, my hon. friend will see that he is mistaken in the statement which he made.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I say I am not mistaken, because when there is a surplus of flour in the United States, and it is very cheap, they go and buy there.

HON. MR. POWER—Order ! Order !

THE SPEAKER—While the gentleman who has the floor is not displeased with any interruptions, no question of order can be raised ; but if an hon. gentleman, when speaking, objects to an interruption, of course I must rule on the question of order.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg in his speech remarked that the excuse made by the War Department in England for sending to America for their pumps for the Soudan was that they could get them more quickly

and with greater facility in the United States than in free trade England; and further on he remarks that France has to go over and buy from a free trade country, England, the ships used in their own trade. In one case the hon. gentleman points to the deficiency in pumps as a proof, and in the other case to the surplus of shipping as a proof that British trade is decreasing under free trade policy.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—And both are correct.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The hon. gentleman remarked that he believed farming to be the basis of all industries, and without it we could not get along and prosper. The hon. gentleman is right at last; he is in accord with that distinguished gentleman, Daniel Webster, who spoke of commerce, agriculture and manufactures as being the three great pillars on which is based the prosperity of a country—the greatest of which is in the centre; the greatest is agriculture, and there comes in the great evil of these high protective duties with which the farmers are handicapped, and which hinders the development of the cattle trade in the Lower Provinces. My hon. friend must know that to carry on stock feeding successfully in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, the farmers must import corn or other produce to feed their immense herds. It would be well perhaps, if they had a level country, to raise this produce themselves; but they do not do it, and they have to import the corn which, to a great extent, they use in fattening their stock, and which is subject to this vexatious duty. He spoke of the great facilities that were given for the transportation of cattle by shipping to foreign markets. I understood him to say that there has been a reduction of freight. I do not know that anything of the kind has been secured by the action of the Government; I do not think they have interfered with the shipping rates in that way, or that they have done anything to facilitate transportation; but what they have done, in order to have an argument for putting a duty on corn and flour, they carry the coal from Nova Scotia to Montreal at a nominal rate—almost free; at all events, it is not more than one-sixth or one-fifth, at the outside, as much per mile per ton as is charged for transporting farm produce. I have not got the figures here to substantiate that statement, but I believe it to be correct nevertheless. I believe that the owners of the Spring Hill Mines, some of whom I believe have become rich, do not pay more than one-eighth of a cent per mile per ton to transport their coal for 700 miles—from Spring Hill to Montreal—and I believe it costs a farmer for his cattle, his hay and grain, and the lumberman for his supplies or products, five times as much for any transportation done for them. And why is that? Simply because the farmer is not in a position to come up here, like the president of a large corporate body, or the manager of a factory, and demand "protection," as they call it. The farmers are simply at the mercy of the other interests. Their interests are handicapped and injured by the demoralizing effect of a protective policy, and yet there is money in the savings bank; still the farmers are progressing—the cheese industry is prosperous; but that state of affairs has not been brought about in any way by the National Policy. It has been brought about, and is continuing in spite of the National Policy, and the disadvantages which that policy has created for the agricultural interests. Agriculture is the industry that is developing and sustaining the country; it is the central pillar which is maintaining and keeping up this Dominion, and when the time of depression comes, as perhaps it has come to a limited extent at present, the farmers will have to bear the burden, and the poor operatives who are turned out of doors without a knowledge of any other business will be dependent upon the farmers for subsistence. Such has been the case in all highly protected countries, as the hon. gentleman well knows. So it is with the lumber interest. The lumber interest is not protected; no one pretends that it is. The Finance Minister himself stated that it was not—that it could not be protected; that everything the lumberman buys for his business—his plant, his supplies, pork, flour, beans and everything which he requires in the way of supplies and clothing for his men, is naturally advanced in price, and notwithstanding this drawback the

lumbermen of New Brunswick last year exported a large amount of lumber.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Our farmers provide the lumbermen with nearly everything they require in the way of supplies.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—By the exports of the farm and the forest, and I dare say of the fisheries also, it will be seen that those three lines of industry have developed, and to that extent the country has certainly prospered, but not because of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg contends that cotton is cheaper in Canada now than it was when this country was a slaughter market for the manufacturers of the United States. We all know that; but cotton goods would be cheaper anyway. They are cheaper all over the world; the raw material is cheaper; the production of the raw and manufactured material is cheaper; transportation is cheaper, and if it were not for the duty imposed by the National Policy, we could get twice as much cotton, twice as much sugar, and twice as much of many other articles to-day for our money as we do. Yet my hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen who hold the same views are accustoming the people of this country, through their speeches and through the press, to consider that it is all through the National Policy that goods are cheaper to-day than they were five years ago. The hon. gentleman, departing from the subject before the House, referred to Mr. Gladstone as an able man and leader of a great party in England; he referred to his policy as being "a shilly-shally policy;" and but for the vacillating policy of Gladstone, Gen. Gordon might have been alive to-day. What has that to do with the National Policy? That was a contingency that might have arisen in any country, and it was a very hard accusation to make against Mr. Gladstone, and had no connection with this debate whatever. If the hon. gentleman wishes to indulge in that kind of reference, I think there are events occurring in our own country; the blood of Canada's sons is crimsoning the snows of the western prairies, they also are entitled to the commiseration of the hon. gentleman; and if he wishes to indulge this fancy, and allow his imagination to roam so as to attach responsibility for such contingencies upon anybody, he can indulge it at home without referring particularly to Mr. Gladstone, who is at the present day the most distinguished man in Great Britain, if not in the world. Referring to the cotton industry, the hon. gentleman contended that the duties on cottons were not a burden on the people. A correspondent of the *Manchester Examiner and Times*, seems to understand the cotton business of Canada pretty well, and replying to another correspondent who had written over the signature of "Verax," says:

"No one knows better than 'Verax' that protection also robs the Treasury, but few perhaps of the general public know to how great an extent this is the case. Of certain classes of cotton goods the Canadians import none; and the reason is not far to seek. A cotton spinner made this calculation, namely, that their protection would pay all the wages of the mill hands. Here, then, the Treasury is completely robbed, and the people of Canada would be as rich if they paid these men and women (the mill hands) their full wages for doing nothing. And this is not all the case against these high duties. The millowners have made no money, but have lost heavily, and if one could only now ship the mills and machinery to Lancashire, they could be had cheap, even for Lancashire prices. No doubt there are other classes of goods no longer imported into Canada. The high protective duties in great part, pay for the wages of the workpeople. This is the way our friends in Canada burden themselves with a poor-rate for mill hands, tax the consumer, and rob their Treasury."

In answer to another observation of my hon. friend, in which he spoke of the increased imports from England, and the decreased imports from the United States, the following figures taken from the trade and navigation tables of the Dominion show how our trade is shaping—they give the value of goods from Great Britain and the United States entered for consumption during the last five fiscal years, and the amount of duties paid on them:

	GREAT BRITAIN.		UNITED STATES.	
	Imports.	Duties.	Imports.	Duties.
1880—$34,451,224		6,737,997	$29,346,948	4,521,311
1881— 43,583,808		8,772,950	35,704,112	5,667,293
1882— 50,593.341		10,011,811	48,289,052	7,082,722
1883— 52,062,466		9,897,785	55,032,333	8,158,623
1884— 43,418,015		8,001,371	50,492,826	7,420,462
Total $224,112,853		43,421,914	$220,865,271	32,839,811

Now, I am reluctant to state this as authentic, because it is exactly the reverse of the figures given by my hon. friend in

his speech, and one or the other must be wrong.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I must be right.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The article in which I happened to notice this statement, further says :—

"How completely our fiscal policy has failed in its professed objects, is shown by two facts: (1) that there is a decrease in the amount of English imports, and an increase in the amount of American imports; and (2) that taking the totals of the five years the average rate of duties on English imports is 19.37 per cent., and on American imports of only 14.80 per cent.

The marked tendency to trade with our neighbors is here shown so clearly that he may run who readeth it; and with such a palpable fact before us, who can doubt that the real interest of both Canada and the United States lies in cultivating the freest possible trade relations between them?"

My hon. friend from Lunenburg twice, in his address, remarked that agricultural implements are no more expensive anywhere in Canada to-day than they were in 1878. If he will allow me I will read to him something that I think will convince him to the contrary, as well as other hon. gentlemen who alluded to the same subject, and who mentioned particularly that they were not dearer in our North-Western territory. I shall read from a newspaper published in the North-West.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—What is the name of it?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The name of it is the Regina *Leader;* and the editor, I see his name at the top, is Mr. Nicholas Flood Davin. That ought to be a good authority for the hon. gentleman.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I am glad that you are pleased with him.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The article in qestion is in the form ot a letter, but given in the editorial column. It is from a gentleman who was formerly a resident of New Brunswick, and who was standard bearer for the Conservative party in the county of Sunbury, at the last general election. Being unsuccessful in the contest, he moved to the North-West a short time ago. He was a very strong supporter of the Government, and of their general policy, and especially of the National Policy, with all its embellishments. He says :—

"I first have to say I did not make a general slaughter of the National Policy. In speaking of the National Policy, I said that many articles were cheaper, including cotton and woollen goods, and that living to-day was cheaper in Canada than at any former period."

Hon. gentlemen must see he has the same sound that they have; he must be "true blue."

HON. MR. HOWLAN—What is the date of that paper?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—It is the 17th March of this year. He continues :—

It is true I did take exception to the tariff on agricultural implements as being against the interest of the settlers in the North-West, and I am firm in that opinion, Mr. Wright notwithstanding to the contrary. If my memory serves me aright, I did not ask for a change in the tariff, however desirable such a thing might be on some articles. I only suggested that inasmuch as we were not, and never could be, a manufacturing people, that we should have some consideration given us in lieu of the high tarift on implements. Certainly, there could be nothing radically wrong in that.

Further on he remarks :—

It is said there is a great deal in a name. These men who had to pay the larger price were "small farmers." In the name in this connection the matter is reversed, the big farmer paying the small price and the small farmer *vice versa.* Implement firms put a premium on big farmers' patronage, and the big-farm policy was the policy that got Mr. Wright his binder so cheaply. Now, the N. P. as a national policy for the Dominion of Canada I am in favor of, and always have been; but I do not think it is advantageous to the North-West, and I am at a loss to see how any man can think it is. We can't manufacture a single article, not even an axe handle; we are left entirely at the tender mercies of the Ontario manufacturers. I have always been under the impression that the N. P. was to encourage home industries, and in the Eastern Provinces it has done so: hence my remark that it was life to the east.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear, hear!

"I am aware that no country can have two separate and distinct tariffs; but I do think, inasmuch as the high tariff on implements and several other articles we are compelled to

purchase largely of, must necessarily make those articles dearer, that we should have some adequate consideration given us for it. Many are the opportunities in which the Government could assist us, which would be taken kindly by the people. Forty-five cents is the highest price paid to-day for the best of wheat, and it takes, on an average, about six bushels of the best wheat that nine out of ten farmers have to sell, to buy a bag of flour. I saw a farmer yesterday who had brought a load of wheat in here (Wolseley) for sale, a distance of fifteen miles, and he sold it for $10. He said it would make sixteen bags of flour. His complaint was loud and bitter. Now, as bonuses are the order of the day, I would suggest that the Government bonus some grist mills in this country, and save the municipalities from incurring a debt that will be oppressive on them, as they have enough to be taxed for in the ordinary course of things."

Of course, that is the order of the day, that the Government should bonus the grist mills of this country! And why not? Why should they not bonus the grist mills, when they give a bonus on pig iron and other things? Mr. Perley concludes his letter by saying:

"In conclusion, I have to say, that while I am free to confess that I am a party man, I am, nevertheless, free to defend the rights and best interests of my country, or rather my home. And my politics are—first my country, the North-West; next, the party.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am afraid my hon. friend cannot get much comfort from that letter.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—It is a very good letter. Were there any comments by the editor of the paper, on that letter?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—That would come better from your side if there are any.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Give us the editor's opinion on that letter.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am willing to give the opinion of a supporter of the Government on the question of the duty on agricultural implements, and I am willing to pass the paper over to my hon. friend from Alberton, and let him see what the editor says. The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg gives as an instance of the depressed state of trade, and the poverty of the working classes in England, the fact that in the city of London alone there are 60,000 families to-day that have only one little room or garret for each family, and all the high moral feeling of that hon. gentleman seemed to well up in describing the unhappy, the unsatisfactory, and the degrading circumstances under which those families are huddled together. I have made some reference to this statement before. The area of the country being small, and the city of London of immense size, with a concentration of people there, growing out of the enormous trade that they have, and largely made up of people of all nations in the world, it is not suprising under the circumstances that tenements should be so crowded, and I have no doubt that benevolent people in London are constantly trying to alleviate any distress which may prevail; but under the high tariff and with the enormous exodus of people from Nova Scotia, it will be a long time before that complaint of overcrowded tenements can be made by the hon. member from Lunenburg, as far as Halifax is concerned. Then he says the people of the United States are a unit in demanding protection for their industries. Does my hon. friend still adhere to that?

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Yes.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am surprised to hear it. Then he says that there were 11,000 miles of railway under construction or projected in the United States last year. How far he may be accurate in that I will endeavor to show by referring to an article from the London *Mail* of January 10th, 1885, headed "New Railways in the United States," which shows that the number of miles of railway built in the United States last year was 3,729.

HON. MR. KAULBACH — That is constructed—I did not say constructed; I said under construction or projected.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The article in the *Mail* is as follows:—

"According to the *Railroad Gazette*, the total mileage of railways constructed in the United States during 1884 amounts 3,729 This is not much over half the mileage of 1883, and a little over one-third of that of 1882. There were constructed during the

previous twelve years:—1883, 6,130 miles; 1882, 9,922; 1881, 7,870; 1880, 6,139; 1879, 3,801; 1878, 2,263; 1877, 2,019; 1876, 2,278; 1875, 1,333; 1874, 1,844; 1873, 3,630; and 1872, 7,160 miles. These figures include main track only, no account being taken of second tracks or sidings."

The point which my hon. friend must have intended to make was that their business was flourishing, and that they were increasing the construction of railways. That, however, is not correct, according to this, because the mileage of railways constructed during 1884 was not much over half the mileage of 1883, and only a little over one-third of the mileage of 1882. I do not see that he can draw any conclusion in favor of his view that a highly protected country is progressing more rapidly than a free trade country. My hon. friend said that the New South Wales bonds are higher than ours. In that he is correct.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I showed the reason why.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I think he said it was because they had an agent in London.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—An agent in London, to boom them.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—It is well known in England that New South Wales is one of the Australian colonies that adheres strictly to free trade, and hence they have laid the basis of a large prosperity which Victoria, Tasmania and surrounding colonies do not possess, and I can inform the House that there is a marked difference in the development of their trade. I was favored with a letter from a clergyman of the Church of England—I am sorry I have not it in my possession now—a very intelligent and well-written letter, describing the trade policies of those colonies, and the better position in which New South Wales stood in consequence of their trade policy as compared with that of the adjoining colonies, and with how much more rapid strides they were progressing and increasing their wealth and commerce, and that there was no disposition in New South Wales to recede from the English plan of free trade.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—Does the hon. gentleman know what the taxation is per head of New South Wales?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—No.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—It is $35 or $40 per head there.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am speaking of this letter from the clergyman. He supposed his views on political questions differed from mine, and he thought that I was wrong, but when I answered him I was able to concur in his opinion. He is a clergyman and not a politician at all.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—New South Wales is prospering although the taxation is high.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The hon. gentleman referred to the great expansion of the coal trade in Nova Scotia, as a result of the National Policy, of course. It was in that connection that this statement was made. Now, if my hon. friend will revert back to the history of Nova Scotia, say four decades—40 years—and look at the output of coal during each decade, he will observe that the increase was greater during former decades than during the period in which this National Policy has been in operation. I have a report of the mines of Nova Scotia, according to which the output was one-third more in the decade ending 1860 than in 1850, and in 1870 it was a little more than twice as much as in 1860. In 1880 it shows only an increase of about 50 per cent. over 1870, and for the last four years it has not come up even to the same average.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—My hon. friend must see that during the five years that his party were in power it went down, while during the last five years it has gone up.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—But the contention of the hon. gentleman is that it has increased latterly at a greater ratio than ever before, and I think the figures which I have furnished do no bear out that conclusion. Then my hon. friend referred to the great contentment which exists in Nova Scotia. I would again

mention the debates in the House of Assembly, during the late session of the legislature, and also a resolution condemning the action of the Dominion Government a year ago—the session before last—couched in very strong terms. I have not the resolution here, but my hon. friend from Lunenburg must remember it, and therefore I think the statement that perfect harmony prevails in Nova Scotia, is scarcely a correct one to make. My hon. friend from Belleville who is not in has place—it is exceedingly difficult to make references to those speeches when my hon. friends refuse to listen, and I am very sorry to do so—

HON. MR. PLUMB—Do not stop on that account.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The hon. gentleman makes a reference to the fact that he had a good deal to do with the first inception of the National Policy. It turns out that there are others laying claim to it also, but I suppose he is like a good many inventors of patent medicines and other devices for extracting money from people—they run very well, but come to grief sooner or later. St. Jacob's Oil was very well to trade with for a while, but old St. Jacob himself, like the inventor of the National Policy, remained in obscurity. The hon. gentleman from Belleville spoke about the export of cheese. He says that it is greater now than in 1877. In 1877 there was 81,834 lbs. of cheese imported from the United States, and the duty paid on it was $2,455; in 1884 the imports were 104,240 lbs., valued at $17,560, and the duty paid on it was $3,127. So the statement of the hon. gentleman is simply erroneous. My hon. friend from Lunenburg says that this country once sold cows to the United States and we bought their cheese; but look at Canada now, he says. Well, we are now purchasing more cheese than we did then.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—We are better able to do so.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Of course we are; but why should the hon. gentleman make such statements? It must be apparent to himself that they are not borne out by the facts.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Do we not consume more cheese?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I am not speaking of that. My hon. friend from Belleville speaks of there being no clamoring for work. Well, if the Ottawa lumber trade was depressed and the Chaudiere mills were shut down, and two or three influential gentlemen with prospects of promotion—and who subsequently were promoted—if they, with the desire of pleasing a strong party, chose to adopt the course which is open to them, I venture to say that any Government in Ottawa under any circumstances would find a crowd of people gathered in the streets demanding work. Those individuals who participated in manipulating that gathering, have gone to their reward—I mean their political reward, of course. The hon. member from Belleville might have referred to another crowd, to a number of people better dressed than they were perhaps—but after all, probably, no better in many ways—many of them very good and respectable men, and they were not content with coming once, or twice, or thrice, but they are coming every year. They are in a position to come with power, to demand that the people shall be taxed to benefit them and fill their pockets, and their prayers are heard. According to their judgment they get what they fancy will benefit them because it will hurt somebody else—because it restricts other people's liberty of trade, and compels them to buy their products and stocks. It is a great delusion; it is a manifest delusion. I am not glad for their misfortunes, but I do hope that experience will teach them, like the manufacturers of Lancashire, where 10 per cent. of the mills were shut down, to come to the same conclusion, that after all it is better to let trade run in its own natural healthy channel, and not undertake to force others—the lumbermen, the farmers and fishermen—to build up vast concerns only to be tumbled down in times of depression. It is an act of legalized injustice. Those are the crowds of people to whom the hon. gentleman might well have directed his attention. My hon. friend from Hamilton spoke about sewing machines, and he explained how it came to pass that the makers of sewing machines in the United States, since the adoption of the

National Policy in Canada, reduced their price—that they sold lower by $6 apiece to Canadian customers than they were willing to sell to their own customers. If that practice is pursued by them, one would suppose that their own customers in the United States would find it out and not be too well pleased. It is just an instance of making their own people pay more than what is fair for their manufactures, in order that they may be able to supply them to foreigners at a lower price. In this way the hon. gentleman explains why it is that the sewing machine manufacturers of Hamilton are doing a less profitable business under the National Policy than they did before under free trade.

HON. MR. TURNER—I explained how the increased importation was.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—There are more sewing machines imported into than exported from Canada.

HON. MR. TURNER—No.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—My hon. friend remarked that if he was in Scotland, he would be a free-trader, as he was before.

HON. MR. TURNER—I did not say that. I said I would be a free-trader under the same circumstances.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I was struck with that observation. It may not have come to the notice of my hon. friend that some of the largest concerns engaged in manufacturing sewing machines in the United States have invested immense sums in putting up establishments in England for the manufacture of sewing machines. Why?

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Because they make so much in their own country that they can afford to do it.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—It is simply because they find the materials and labor cheaper in that free-trade country, and they can manufacture the sewing machines more cheaply than they could in their own country, and thus are enabled to supply foreign markets.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—But labor is dearer in England, you told us.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—No; I said dearer in England than on the continent. So, my hon. friend if he was a free-trader in Scotland, will come to the conclusion that he should be a free-trader in Canada, too. But he says we have commenced to develop our North-West. We in the east have had a most glowing description of that country and that is one reason why there is so much unrest, because young people become dissatisfied with their own farms and homesteads and come to the conclusion that they must go west, but unfortunately they do not go to the North-West, but they go to the Western States.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Oh no.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—My hon. friend says, "Oh no," but I am aware that they do to a very large extent. I know of few families in the North-West who have moved there from New Brunswick. It would be much better for Canada if we could keep our own people for our own country. I have no doubt, we have a very good soil in the North-West, and that it is a very desirable country to settle in, but so far as launching out into the prairies and developing the North-West is concerned, and in two decades hence seeing a population there which will astonish the world, I only hope it will be true, but it will not come to pass under the railway policy, protective policy and land policy of the present Government.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—That is just what will do it.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I do not believe that it will be so under the policy pursued by the Minister of the Interior, and the Minister of Railways and the Government of this country. We had statements made on the resolutions for the union of British Columbia by gentlemen whose faces I do not see in this Chamber this evening. They said by the time the railway was constructed there would be 7,000,000 of people in Canada. I am very sorry to say that our country is not keeping even natural increase. There is

no income of people into Canada; they have gone away as fast as they have come and I have adduced proof which, to a large extent, confirms that statement. I say it with regret, but because it is the truth, I do not see why it should be withheld. Therefore, I say that the prophecies which have been made by gentlemen representing the Conservative side of the House during the time I have had the honor to occupy a seat in this Chamber, have not been fulfilled. They have not told us the truth. They have not fulfilled their own expectations in any degree, and the country to-day, from one end to the other—from British Columbia, which has formed a vigilance committee to drive out the Chinese, to Nova Scotia which has introduced resolutions for disruption—

HON. MR. KAULBACH—That is the work of a few discontented Grits.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—And Prince Edward Island, which petitioned the Queen against the policy of the Dominion Parliament.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Prince Edward Island has not petitioned against the policy of the Government; it has petitioned the Queen to have the terms of Confederation carried out.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Part of the policy of the Government is to provide increased accommodation across the straits. That has not been done, according to the Legislature of the Island, and hence they have appealed to the Queen. That, certainly, is a fact.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—They endorse the policy of this Government.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I wish to make references now to the question which is more particularly under the consideration of the Senate, and to that I would have confined my observations if the hon. gentlemen on the other side had done so.

HON, MR. KAULBACH—I did so in my remarks.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg is constantly interrupting the hon. gentleman from Albert.

THE SPEAKER—It is altogether out of order for any hon. gentleman to interrupt another who has the floor.

HON. MR. DEVER—I should like to see this debate finished to-night, and we could do so if it were not for the interruptions, and interjections of people who only want to be prominent.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I admit that my interruptions have been out of place, but from what I heard from the hon. gentleman himself I was under the impression that he did not object to them. He said he was going to confine himself to the question before the House, and that he would have done so, if hon. gentlemen on the other side had set him the example. I merely remarked that if he referred to me, I had confined myself to the question.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I wish to say on the point of order that in other places it is quite common to interject an objection to a statement made in a speech. If the hon. gentleman had himseif objected to such interruptions, nobody of course could say a word.

THE SPEAKER—The point of order was raised, and I have stated my opinion.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Before referring to the commissioners' report, there is one other subject to which I wish to refer. When the hon. gentlemen who discussed this question on the other side, became exhausted for statements, they invariably fell back on the assertion that the popular verdict had been in their favor. The electors—those public committees to which the hon. member from Alberton referred—had decided in favor of the present condition of things. That is an argument to which it is much more difficult to reply. I only make a reference to it now, because I do not wish to entirely pass it over. My hon. friends are entitled to any consolation and benefit they may get from it, and I dare say they may get a good deal of consolation and benefit. There is this to be said about it, that during the boom that came on as a result of this National

Policy, no doubt there was a great deal of delusion and strong feeling evinced, stimulated, as it was in high quarters, by the statement that there was a great deal of money to be made by investments in North-West lands, and new industries ; a good many were deluded and were unwise or wise enough to make such investments, and the consequence was that there was a good deal done in the way of building, and much stimulus given to manufacturing industries ; there was an undue and unhealthy stimulus given to certain lines of industries. In the midst of all this, the election was held, and the issue was not fairly put before the people—I am speaking of the last election. The liberties of the people were largely taken from them, and a fair and honest expression of opinion could not be got in consequence of the Gerrymander Bill. That was an act of the Government which savored of despotism. It restricted the liberties of the people still more than any policy they had inaugurated, and yet the time for holding the election, and the manner in which they guarded against the free action of the people in the matter indicated that they themselves were skeptical as to the result of their policy. There were a great many other considerations and influences in the progress of events in this Canada of ours, which certainly placed in the hands of the Government of the day a great deal of power, provided they chose to use it in an unscrupulous manner. The arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the enormous allowances made to it, and the perquisites which belonged to it, practically yielding up the country to that corporation, in some degree made us all subject to its behests. Then the subsidizing of a number of other railways, using up the large revenues of the country, which the people are compelled to pay in addition to what they contribute to the manufacturers; using up the revenues which this very restrictive tariff has enabled the Government to secure ; they have subsidized railroads and appointed officials everywhere. With our small population, the percentage of officials, place-hunters, contractors, etc., is very large relatively to the number of voters. Then of course there is in the hands of the Government the great public domain, the timber limits, the land grabs, as they are sometimes called, colonization companies, which I believe have been denounced by the organ of the Government as being composed of fools ; the cattle ranches, the coal limits and the contracts in connection with public works, the enormous amount of money in Dominion notes—$1,000 notes available for any special purpose —bribery brigades, commissions, negotiable and non-negotiable ; there is also the mighty influence of all those protected magnates who have an idea that they not only have got a lot of money out of the policy, but may get more. It is not surprising, looking at all these appliances, that the Government are maintained by a system which is like a despotism—a species of bossism or one-man power. We can see every day what is passing around us, and the leaders vainly imagine that they can so dam up the liberties of the people that there can be no outbreak ; but there will be an outbreak certainly, and all this will come to an end. They may use their resources in such a way as to restrict the liberties of the people ; but in the end it will surely result in their overthrow, or if not I despair of the future of Canada. I wish now to make some reference to the report of the Factory Commissioners about which the inquiry was made by the hon. member from Victoria, and the speech which he made I must say was confined to that particularly and was an able and proper one, about which I have very little to observe ; but he says in one part of his address "that some of the newspapers of the Liberal party have endeavored to impugn the accuracy of the report and neutralize its effects in the country ; but that they had not been able to place their finger on one figure, or group of figures, and say that it is wrong." With reference to that particular statement of my hon. friend I take issue most distinctly. His enquiry relates to the circulation of this book, which purports to be, on the back of it, a report on the manufacturing industries of Canada. That is not the fact, because a very important province, British Columbia, is not mentioned in it at all. Surely in the province of British Columbia under the National Policy there should be some manufacturing industries.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD—The commissioners say that they have not gone over the whole country.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—Then the title is wrong. The last page of the work shows that the commissioners have received $3,000 and upwards, and expect considerably more; that no doubt is correct, but the parts between these two extremes I think are exceedingly inaccurate.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—Will the hon. gentleman name some of the inaccuracies?

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—Yes, I will refer to some of them. I have not read through the report on the Ontario and Quebec factories. It only takes up 35 pages anyway, while the report on the Maritime Provinces takes up all the rest, or 167 pages. In Mr. Blackaby's report I see he refers to the Kingston locomotive works, and says that the manager of these works was unfortunately not at home, and therefore he could not get correct data.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—And for that reason it makes the report less.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—It is a pity he could not have got the information from some of the clerks. He says:—

"The Kingston Locomotive Works employed in the neighborhood of 150 hands in 1878, and is now only furnishing employment to about 30. The manager of these works was, unfortunately, away from home during the time the Kingston works were being visited, and for that reason no reliable data was obtained with reference to the works."

I have no doubt at all that there were other manufactories where the managers or proprietors were not at home at the time. I merely read this because there are many gentlemen in this Chamber who know more about the Kingston locomotive and car works than I do, and I daresay they will understand better than I can, why the manager was not in. Hon. Mr. Willis, formerly editor and proprietor of St. John *Morning News*, a strongly Liberal and Free Trade paper up to 1878, became slightly readjusted in his editorial opinion about that time, and his old patrons not appreciating so rapid a change of base, the newspaper became a "waning industry," and ultimately was abandoned. It was quite a proper proceeding that he should be employed for this special purpose to assure the people that they are doing well, whether they are or not. In his general remarks, he says:

"Taking a note of the work done, the indications are plain that there has been, on the whole, a marked advance in industrial pursuits, and in material progress generally. Even in St. John, notwithstanding the exceptional circumstances which surround the year with which 1884 is contrasted, evidence of fair progress is not wanting, though the business stringency of the year just passing away makes it difficult for persons unacquainted with industrial methods to give full credence to the statement."

That sentence certainly expresses a great deal, and much of it is no doubt true, or as nearly true as "the exigencies of party" admit. He continues:

"Anything which sheds light on the subject in a fairly accurate form and the statements furnished are as nearly correct as anything of the kind can well be made, must prove useful, at least to those who appreciate at its proper worth the value of statistical information."

That is a very good preface. He says, however, of the lumber industry, in two or three places, that it has been a losing one, and that the evils which have come upon other industries have been brought about through that cause.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—Which cause?

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—He attributes to the low prices for lumber, and the depression in that trade the troubles which he speaks of, and if my hon. friend will read the tabular statement showing the number of hands employed in and about St. John, he will discover that the commissioner states that there were more hands employed in and about the mills, and in connection with the lumber business in St. John last year, than there were in 1878. Then again he says it is not the hard times that has brought about depression in the lumber trade, but it is the fact that the ship-building industry has gone down. If my hon. friend will examine the tables again he will find that there were more men employed in the ship-yards last year than there were in 1878. He says, speaking of the industrial life of the city of St. John:—

"Compared with its state a quarter of a century ago, the shipbuilding interest except-

ed, it contrasts as does the giant oak with the sapling juniper."

Now, this is a metaphor I do not understand. Which year represents "the giant oak" and which year represents the "sapling juniper?" This must be understood to know what the commissioner means by this paragraph. While he is disposed to attribute all the difficulties to the depression in the ship-building and lumbering interests, he actually sets forth in his statement the fact that there are more men employed in those industries than there were in 1878. Then he speaks of the bad crops of the past two years. In the speeches put into His Excellency's hands the past two years, at the opening of Parliament, we are told what fine crops we have had; but the commissioner sent out by the Finance Minister to report on all those things, says that the crops have not been good. In his remarks on the cotton industry the commissioner says:—

"This industry has for some time been in rather an unhealthy condition. The decline is due to a number of causes. First, to the failure of certain important crops for a couple of years, and to the depression in the lumber trade."

It is a singular fact, however, and I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman from Victoria to it, that the lumber export last year has been very large. It was not very remunerative, but the freights were very low, and spruce logs sold at about $7.50 per thousand feet at St. John, whereas in 1878 they were only worth $5 per thousand feet. I mention that as a very significant fact, and yet we are told by the commissioner that the decline in the lumber trade is the cause of the depression in the cotton industry. That cannot be the cause, because the lumber exports have been large, according to the return, and the number of hands employed were larger last year than in 1878. The commissioner goes on to give a second reason for the depression in the cotton trade, as follows:—

"Secondly, to the miscalculation of manufacturers as to the consuming powers of the world's cotton centres in a time of short crops and general business depression."

Some of my hon. friends who have invested largely in the cotton industry, will examine this statement with great care; it will require a great deal of study in order to understand it. He continues:—

"Thirdly, to the large sameness in the cotton product of the Dominion, and the shortsightedness of usually shrewd men, in overlooking the variety requirement when taking advantage of the stimulating influence of the tariff; fourthly, to the too great dependence placed upon special centres to distribute the manufactured goods, and the inadequate efforts to secure more extended markets; fifthly, to the high price ruling for raw cotton, due to the shortness of the cotton crop of the past year or so, and the brisk demand for raw cotton by producers, who, blind to a state of facts with which they should be familiar, kept glutting the market and burning their fingers; and lastly, to the depression in trade generally all over the world."

The tariff is not blamed for anything. Then, referring to the boot and shoe industry, the commissioner reports:—

"The boot and shoe business in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia is not so flourishing as in some former years. The general depression has retarded its progress, and over-production, which gives rise to keener competition, has cut into prices. Employers and workmen suffer in consequence, and the general public enjoys only a seeming benefit. Complaints among employers as to the National Policy are neither very numerous nor very serious."

The boot and shoe industry was a healthy, prosperous business before the National Policy was introduced, but our province has been made a kind of sacrifice market for the surplus stocks of the Montreal manufactories, and the New Brunswick manufacturers probably suffered thereby. The complaints among the employers, he says, are neither very numerous nor very serious; but he admits enough to show that the manufacturers are not satisfied with the result of the tariff. Referring to the clothing industry, he says that that trade "is affected injuriously by the general depression, and to a very considerable extent." Commenting on the bread, biscuit and cake industry of St. John, the Commissioner says:—

"The bread and biscuit bakers, in some few instances, object to the National Policy *in toto;* but, in the majority of cases, they only look upon it with disfavor so far as it affects the price of the material used in bread-making, for which it is alleged, they realize no adequate return from the consumer."

The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg

says that the tariff does not increase the price of bread. The baker says it do and the commissioner confirms it. Pe sing on to the lumber trade the comm s. sioner reports :—

"The lumber trade has been passing through a longer critical period than almost any other. The glutting of the English markets, upon which our spruce deal manufacturers have largely depended, by our own manufacturers as well as by the manufacturers of other lumber producing countries, and the *under-consumption* to which the world's business troubles have given rise, have brought down upon the lumber producing countries unpleasant results. Depression in this industry means depression in every branch of labor to the sustainment of which it contributes, and for a year or two this condition of things has prevailed."

Now, I venture the statement that the Trade and Navigation Returns will show that there has been a large export of lumber for the year 1884, and I stated a moment ago, myself, the prices which prevailed for logs in St. John, in the years 1878 and 1884. Then, in the execution of his duty, which under his commission was

"To procure information as to the manufacturing industries in existence in the maritime provinces of the Dominion of Canada, as regards the number of persons employed, the amount of capital invested, the output thereof, the date of establishment, and the progress of the several factories,"

he goes on to particularize, and in order to make a good showing, he drags into his tabulated statement of the industries in the city and county of St. John, the "artists, barbers, bakers, butchers, blacksmiths, florists, fishermen, horse-shoers, ice-dealers," as benefiting by the National Policy. The ice business is not an industry that has been injuriously affected by the National Policy, certainly not this winter. He goes on to give, amongst the rest, "joiners, jewellers, laundrymen, milliners, painters, photographers, printers, shipbuilders, shipsmiths, sawfilers, stone cutters, sausage makers, seamstresses undertakers, umbrella-repairers, barbers," and so on, as new industries which are benefited by the National Policy. Amongst others he includes saw-millmen. The Finance Minister said that the millmen were a class that he could not reach at all with his National Policy, but the commissioner brings them all into his list of the industries and manufactures which have developed in consequence of the adoption of a high tariff. I am sure that my hon. friend from Victoria would have eliminated from the report, if he had seen it, the men employed in the saw-mills. Speaking of Sackville—I shall give the commissioner's own story, because the style is rather unique, he says :—

"Sackville, the only other place in Westmoreland county which, in the time at my disposal, could be visited, is unquestionably a town of great length, great resources and much wealth; the abode of a faculty of learned professors, the resting place of some illustrious dead, the birthplace of a noble educational institution, the home of a happy and contended people, and last, but not least, the headquarters of one of the most successful stove foundries in the Lower Provinces.

Well, that stove foundry is a good thing, and was prosperous many years ago.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—What is false about that statement ?

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Nothing ; I am merely reading it as a matter of information. He says that milliners are in good request in Moncton. No doubt it is a good advertisement for milliners who are in search of situations.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It shows the prosperity of the country, or the people would not be able to indulge in such luxuries.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—Referring to Amherst, the leading town in Cumberland county, the commissioner says, it is quite a manufacturing centre, some dozen or more factories being in active operation within its limits. He adds :—

"There is about the place a smart business-like appearance, and abundant evidence of the well-to-do condition of its people. It is famous, among other things, as being the place around which political gladiators, in the olden time, delighted to hover, its rostrum furnishing the battlefield for many keen oratorical encounters. The most prominent of the town's industries are the stove foundry of A. Robb & Co., the sash, door, blind and wooden-ware factory of Rhodes, Curry & Co., the coffin and casket factory of Christie Bros. & Co., and the spacious works of the Amherst Boot and Shoe Company."

Although the scene of another battlefield, Amherst does not seem to have any illustrious dead like Sackville, a notable example of the survival of the fittest and

most illustrious. That is all very useful information no doubt, for which the commissioner should be well paid. He also made a small circuit of Prince Edward Island, and of one of the towns there, he says :—

"There is not much doing; however, the people of Summerside are not apprehensive about the future.

"They cultivate a cheerful spirit, and look hopefully ahead. They will always be able to claim for their own town and vicinity preeminence as a pleasant summer resort."

That is cheerful at any rate, and is calculated to console everybody from that beautiful island, whether it flourishes under the National Policy or not. Further on he quotes the opinions expressed by some of the gentlemen on whom he called—

"Mr. N. Powers, undertaker, reports the general health of the city good, probably better than in 1878. He adds, with grim good humor:—Times are somewhat tough, but then this toughness is not common to St. John; it affects the world at large. My business, like most other trades, is affected by hard times, inasmuch as people call for cheaper work than in prosperous times."

Then he calls on Mr. John J. Munroe, who owns a trunk factory, who reports "business this year is very good—better than last year, and better than 1878."

Of course it is; people are going away from the province, and I can well understand that trunks are in demand everywhere. I have no doubt at all that the trunk factory is flourishing. Then he gives a statement of Messrs. Stewart & White, furniture manufacturers. Those gentlemen report that trade is dull now, and add :—

"The tariff is unjust to furniture manufacturers who use fine goods, for the manufacture of which there is not now, nor likely to be, any provision in the near future."

I have marked a number of passages that have a certain degree of interest, but time does not permit of my referring to them all. I think the commissioner has tried as far as the "exigencies" of the circumstances have allowed, to make as complete a statement as possible; but it is a very confused report, contradictory in its parts, and fictitious in some particulars, though I have no doubt not through any bad intent.

McNichol & Russell, merchant tailors, are reported as saying in reply to the commissioner's inquiries :—

"Business not so booming as in 1878, nor as good as last year. The general depression and diminished work for the laboring classes causes business to languish. Confederation hasn't helped our business. It enables the Montreal and western dealers to overload our market with the goods of the same description as we make, and at prices below competing figures."

Edward Hayes, a biscuit baker, says :—

"The National Policy is not helpful to my business. I use about two-thirds American flour. The American article is preferred because of its strength."

Then there is quite an interesting report from Mr. John Parks, of the Park's, or New Brunswick, Cotton Mills, who says :—

"Business this year is the worst I have seen in my experience, especially during the last three months."

At Fredericton, McFarlane, Thompson & Anderson's foundry, started 13 years ago, is reported to be prospering. They do not know that the National Policy hurts them much in a general way. In one respect, however, it operates to their prejudice. They say their market to buy is in the United States; but the tariff forces them to go to Ontario for malleable castings, at a much larger first cost, and much higher freight charged than they formerly paid to foundries in the Republic. They add :—

"The Londonderry Iron Works make very good iron, but at present there is little or nothing being done there. We find it better to import our pig and bar iron from the old country. Most of the iron we now use is Scotch pig."

When the commissioner comes to report on the Londonderry Iron Works, he makes out that there are a large number of hands employed, and I do not see how that compares with the statement of the foundrymen above alluded to, who say that "there is not much doing there." The Londonderry iron is protected by a high duty in the first place; then there is an additional bounty put upon the pig iron, and after that they had almost nominal rates for the transport of coal, and after that they had the credit of the Government for the transport of the coal —and a long credit, too, I think. I might go further on through this report, but I do not propose to do so. I am sorry to weary hon. gentlemen, but this subject has

been very ably referred to by my hon. friend from Victoria, and he mentions this report as being very exact and accurate in all its statements. He will find, however, that the tables are totally unreliable. I will call his attention to page 74 and page 134. He states on page 74 that the town of Woodstock has 14 new industries, started since 1878, employing 113 hands, whose yearly aggregate of weekly wages amounts to $510,010. That would be an average of $4,513 a week for each hand, and yet my hon. friend says that the Liberal press is entirely wrong when it says that this report is inaccurate.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—It is a printer's mistake evidently.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—The same statement appears in two different places, and if a typographical error the totals would not correspond, but they do in the report, and it requires a great deal of exertion sometimes to counteract the effects which such statements produce. I have been trying all the evening myself to correct palpable errors of the hon. gentlemen opposite. To send the report all over the country with such mis-statements would be positively delusive and misleading, and therefore the statement of my hon. friend that the newspapers were wrong in their criticisms is not justifiable. This report would be about as useful and reliable, so far as the information which it professes to contain is concerned, as the Arabian Nights, or some other work of fiction. It is not exactly what the Government or anybody else wanted, but if it is reprinted I would suggest that it be printed in the Chinese language. Many of us will remember the legend of the old piper of Hameln. When that ancient city was infested with rats, which the people heartily desired to get rid of, they agreed to pay the old piper a certain sum of money to do so. The piper by his music and charms, and the grotesqueness of his dress, induced the rats to follow him, and they were destroyed.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—That has been the effect of the hon. gentleman's speeeh on the House. It is decidedly thinned out.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—No, the members did not come in, and I am unable, like the piper, to attract them. What I was going to say to my hon. friend is, if it is proposed to re-print this report it should be printed in the Chinese language, with his additional endorsement of its absolute correctness, in figures and groups of figures—and I can imagine my hon. friend, leading the way through the defiles and canons of the Rockies, with the entire following of the Mongolians wending their way to this Mecca of high wages in Woodstock, N.B., where they would each earn $4,513 a week for wages, and I am sure if my hon. friend would adopt that course he would be favored by the extermination of the Chinese of British Columbia, and then the occupation of the Vigilance Committee will be gone. I trust that my hon. friend will be very much better rewarded if he adopts the suggestion, than the piper to whom I have just alluded as indicated in the sequel to the old story. I am satisfied, however, that my hon. friend will undoubtedly receive proper consideration for the ability which he has displayed in bringing this important subject to the notice of this Chamber, and seeing to it that this report is re-published and circulated everywhere, even in British Columbia; but I say, notwithstanding all the credit which I am disposed to give the commissioner who has been employed to go round and make those inquiries and compile this report, it will scarcely answer any practical end that I know of, unless it reaches the hands of the Mongolian in the manner I have suggested.

I have to apologize again for trespassing so much on the time and attention of this honorable Chamber. I felt that it became my duty, as a representative from one of the Maritime Provinces, and knowing the evils that are springing up amongst us by the inauguration and continuance of this policy, which I know to be invidious and hard to be borne, to state its effect not only there, but in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and in fact throughout the Dominion of Canada. Whatever hon. gentlemen may say, and whatever a majority of this House may say, and whatever they may reiterate, it is a policy which is contrary to English precedent; it is a policy which is calculated to degrade and injure, and lower the interests

of this country. It is a policy which is not suitable to this progressive age. It is a policy which properly belongs to feudal times and a past age—one which the Government, when they come to consider the ill-effect of it, and cast aside those influences by which they surround themselves with power—when they take a patriotic view of those things, and work more for the country and less for their party, will see is not in the best interests of the Dominion. The Minister of the Interior, in reply to my hon. friend from Ottawa, spoke about that lucky star that guides this Government. He spoke of the sunshine in which they are basking. I may say to the Minister of the Interior, that I hope the time may speedily come when the sunshine will not alone fall upon this Government entrenched as they are on the treasury benches, that the dark clouds will break and the whole people of this country will get the benefit of that sunshine; when the laborers and farmers, and the lumbermen and fishermen of this country will reap the full advantages of their toil, and will not be compelled to contribute from their resources further than is necessary for the purposes of government.

HON. MR. DEVER—I am sure after the long and labored debate that has taken place on this great subject it would be the height of bad taste on my part to desire to continue it much longer. It must be a matter of pride to all to see the manner in which the debate has been conducted. It must show to the country that it was the desire of the Senate that a subject affecting the true interests of this country should be debated in the most intelligent and able manner. I feel, myself, notwithstanding the length of this debate, that after all, the jury to determine this question will be the country. Whether one party or the other may fancy they get the victory in this House matters not; it will not have the slightest influence on the people, The arguments pro and con as affecting our commercial interests and our true prosperity will be sifted thoroughly, and I think an accurate judgment will be arrived at by the people. Notwithstanding the great ability displayed on the part of some speakers who took part in this debate, I took notice of what may be called a heresy in political economy, that has been indulged in by both sides in debating this subject. I could not help feeling somewhat surprised that statements should be made that vast quantities of money had been lost to this country by investments in manufacturing industries. It was said that the stockholders had lost their stock and that factories which had cost some $260,000 or $300,000 were a total loss and that business was crippled in consequence of this capital having been taken out of its legitimate course and virtually lost to the country. I take exception to this statement at once. I think I have studied some of the laws of political economy. I think I have been taught to be lieve that when money is taken from the banks or taken from private individuals and put into actual labor in the country, that instead of its being lost to the public it is simply displaced and put into circulation in the hands of the laboring classes. It enters the business of the shop-keepers, the tradespeople, doctors and lawyers and various citizens who dwell in our country. It is true it is taken from one and goes into the possession of another, but still not one dollar is lost to the country. A gentleman who took the opposite side of the argument seemed to think that that proposition was a fair one; he did not think it was wrong. Men go into business and lose their capital. He took it as a matter of fact that the capital was lost, and that men in the lumber trade, for instance, lost their money in the woods, and went into bankruptcy. Now the two cases, according to my view of the strict rules of political economy, are not similar. In the first place, if money be invested in getting lumber, it has to go to a foreign country; and if the expenses incurred are not met by the amount realized by the sale, then of course there is a loss to the country of the difference between the cost and the amount received from the sale; but in the other case where the work is going on in our own country and the money is paid for labor, I think it will be found on reflection that the statements of hon. gentlemen on the other side are not correct. I do not know that it is necessary for me to go much further into the question; in fact I do not know that I could, if I tried, go over the grounds that have

already been covered. The subject has been ably discussed in all its branches.

We have a grand future before us, if we be true to more than our own private interests, and not be like the Roman guards, who sold at auction, to the highest bidder, the throne of their country.

My own views on the tariff question are steady, and ever have been since I had the honour of a seat in this Chamber. But desiring to bow to the will of the people, I sink them, and acknowledge that the present policy was sustained at the polls.

Until the same people give me to understand that they have changed their minds, I will carry out their views right loyally. Instead, though, of playing "Vicar of Bray," I would rather point out that there is danger ahead, and that the people here, like the people of the United States, are not going to be ridden to death by politicians. One stroke of the pen would let go the whole excise goods of the United States. I would like to know what would become of the frontier of Canada if we had to watch the flood of smuggled goods that would then come in at half the price ours would cost.

But, gentlemen, I have no desire to go, or appear to go, deeply into these matters. The problem of political economy, as applied to the wants of the different countries, is an exercise for statesmen, not for every pretender to tariff making.

I think it is perfectly safe to leave the operations of the present tariff and policy in the hands of the Government. There is a man at the head of the Government who is a statesman as astute as any on this continent. When that statesman considers that the true interest of this country demands an alteration in the tariff, he has sagacity and patriotism enough to adopt it. I think it is perfectly right and safe for us to wait until we see the necessity for a change in our system before making one. I may, perhaps, be inclined to think that a change will take place by degrees in the near future; but until a change shall take place in public opinion I am satisfied to bow to the will of the people.

HON. MR. TURNER—In the absence of the hon. member from Belleville, I should like to say a few words in reply to the hon. member from Hopewell, on the cheese question. Before the National Policy was adopted as a general principle, there were to my knowledge three articles to which the protective principle had been applied. These were vinegar, tobacco and cheese, in all of which articles we control our own market, and, as regards the latter, we are now large exporters. I can recollect—it is not very long ago—when there was no merchantable cheese made in Canada. There was a duty of 3 cents put on cheese, and from that time the improvement dates. Prior to that the duty was nominal. This increase in the duty was followed by the establishment of cheese factories, and an extraordinary increase in the production, and I now say it, and assert it boldly, that the basis of the improvement in the production was this increase in the duty imposed.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—I do not know that it is worth while for me to discuss the question any further. The debate has been a long and a tedious one, and the hon. gentlemen who have fired their shots and spoken in the negative on the question have left the House. Many of their arguments I should like to review, but as they are not present I shall refrain from doing so; however, I will say a very few words. I will take New Brunswick first, as from that province comes the deepest and loudest howl. We have heard of the condition of affairs there; but the assertions to which we have listened are not borne out by the facts; anyone who looks at the imports and exports for the last five years will see that the condition of trade in that province is not as bad as it has been represented. The hon. gentleman from Albert made some allusion which I did not understand about the Chinese in British Columbia. He imported that question into this discussion, though I cannot see what bearing it has upon the trade policy of the Dominion; but I will say this that there are Chinamen fully as intelligent and as well informed as he is, in many parts of British Columbia and in China. The hon. gentleman did not confine himself to the question at issue, the trade policy of the country, but went beyond it into abstract questions which it is perfectly impossible to answer, and if it were possible, would be of no benefit to any-

one. I have no intention to answer the long arguments of the hon. gentlemen from St. John and Albert. Whenever they approached the question at issue what course did they pursue? They merely tried to asperse the reports of the commissioners, but they have failed to show in what respect they were defective. Even the hon. member from Albert had to pay a tribute of respect to the commissioner for New Brunswick. He could only discover a typographical error, which was apparent to everyone. The New Brunswick commissioner gives both sides of the question, and makes a statement which may, therefore, be taken as more credible than if it had been a party report altogether. The hon. gentleman from New Brunswick said that the National Policy was driving the young people from that province, because their trade relations were hampered. How can that be the case if there are more people employed in 1884 than there was in 1878? It shows that there is more employment in the country, and if young men are leaving the province, it is from other causes than the National Policy. The hon. member from Albert says that the National Policy interferes with the farmers. I deny that it does. Nearly all the goods that our farmers use are manufactured in the country; so that the National Policy can in no way interfere with them, unless it is to benefit them, because it gives them a larger home market than they formerly had, on account of there being more people employed and getting higher wages in the different manufacturing establishments, than they did formerly. Hon. gentlemen laid great stress on the duty on flour and Indian corn brought into the country. What does that duty amount to? One-fifth of a cent on the pound for Indian corn. Suppose a family were to use 5 pounds in a day, the duty upon that would be only 1 cent a day. The duty on flour is a quarter of a cent per pound, and these are the infinitessimal taxes to which he has referred as grinding down the people. He says that trade should be conducted on the old lines. The old lines have fallen to pieces. From 1873 to 1879 the trade of the country was ruined. There was a howl of despair all over the country, and new lines of trade had to be originated. A new line was struck out and has brought prosperity. Hon. gentlemen have not been able to say that the National Policy has not succeeded. The hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Haythorne) did not contend that at all. He did not say that the country was not more prosperous. He could not say so, and, therefore, he wisely let it alone. He confined himself chiefly to a long dissertation on abstract questions. The hon. gentleman from New Brunswick made a great handle of the increased prices of manufactured articles up in the North-West. As a matter of course that must be the case. The transportation to that country must add to the cost of those articles, and if they are dearer than in Ontario and Quebec, which are nearer hand, it is only what we must expect as a matter of trade. The hon. gentleman from New Brunswick also said when arguments failed that we remarked we have the people with us. We are proud to have them with us; they have twice over ratified the policy of the Government and have sustained the National Policy. If the hon. gentleman had that argument on his side what would he say? What has he brought forward when argument failed him? He has brought forward two or three letters from obscure fishermen; he has taken the statements of different people in the United States and other parts of the world; he has read history 55 years old about the trade of England; he has told us about the low prices of sugar, coffee and tallow in England, and he has quoted from speeches made by free traders in the United States, and speeches made in Toronto many years ago which have nothing whatever to do with the question at issue. Our contention is that the trade of the country has increased and improved in every way, comparing 1884 with 1878; that was the question that was brought before the Senate. Now we will take the revenue derived from New Brunswick during the five years from 1875 to 1879 and the five years from 1880 to 1884. The figures show a wonderful evenness over the whole ten years. The difference amounts to about $84,000 a year for the last five years. From 1875 to 1879 the duties collected were $6,066,274, and from 1880 to 1884 $6,489,056.

The highest point reached by the revenue during the Liberal administration was $1,454,000, and the highest point under the present tariff was in 1883 when it reached $1,520,000, a difference only of $66,000. Then the exports are wonderfully even also for the ten years, $28,059,736, under a Liberal Government, and $30,600,702 under a Conservative Government, showing an excess during the last five years under the Conservative Government of $2,540,966. Now a country which has exported that much over the previous five years under the Liberal Government cannot be in a very bad condition. These figures relate to articles the produce of the country, and in 1884, in addition to the produce of the country, $1,000,000 worth more was exported of imported goods; so that whatever the hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick may say for party purposes, the condition of affairs in their province is not as bad as they try to make out.

HON. MR. DEVER—I beg to differ from my hon. friend.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to interrupt.

THE SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman has the floor and should not be interrupted.

HON. MR. DEVER—I simply wish to explain that these exports are the natural products of the province, and not increased by the National Policy.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman referred to the exodus from New Brunswick. If that hon. gentleman and others continue to decry the country in which they live, and to old up the United States as a more desirable country than ours, people, of course, will leave Canada. The leaders of the party to which the hon. gentlemen belong continually extol the United States, and decry their own country. The hon. gentleman from New Brunswick also alluded to the wonderful wealth which England had accumulated under a free-trade system. No one doubts the wealth of England, and no one would think for a moment of comparing the wealth of that country with that of any of the colonies; but comparisons are made between the taxation of the two countries, and such comparisons are very favorable to Canada. The taxation in England is $3.25 per head higher than the taxation in Canada, and with regard to the large accumulation of trade in England it has been chiefly or largely due to the civil war in the United States. That war threw the whole shipping trade of the world almost into the hands of England; and the manufacturing for 42,000,000 of people besides, and English manufacturers reaped immense fortunes from that war. It swept the United States commerce from the seas, and all the ressources of the United States were taxed to the utmost in the struggle with the rebellions states, so that they could not manufacture for themselves. That is one reason of the great prosperity of the free-trade England, between 1861 and 1873; but since the latter date things have been very different. Trade has been in a very depressed condition indeed, and thousands of men are starving; hundreds of mills are closed, and manufacturing could not be in a worse condition, I am sorry to say. Allusion has been made to the Mother Country, and her prosperity and her wealth, but her poor manufacturing people are anything but prosperous.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I should like to remind my hon. friend that he is speaking entirely under the indulgence of the House. There is no affirmative motion before us, and as it is getting late I would remind the hon. gentleman that he is entirely out of order.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—I am aware that I am speaking with the consent of the House; we have been speaking all along under the indulgence of the House. If I am called to order I will at once sit down.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is making a speech.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—I am only replying to the arguments of other hon. gentlemen.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is keeping us here to a late hour.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman is not obliged to remain.

HON. MR. PLUMB—If I did not remain there would be no quorom, and I am sitting here as a matter of courtesy to the hon. gentleman.

HON. MR. DEVER—The hon. gentleman is out of order, and I wish to make an explanation about New Brunswick.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman from Ottawa, who I am sorry to see is out of his seat, discussed the question with a great deal of warmth and excitement. He accused me of taking an unparliamentary advantage of this House by referring to a report which was not in the hands of members. The hon. gentleman should not have made a charge of that kind. What has been the custom of this House? Has it not been to move for papers and speak of them before they are brought down? The hon. gentleman said also that I had not given sufficient notice. I gave five days notice on my motion, and delayed it five days further, and what is the fact? The papers were not in my hands five minutes before they were being perused by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa, which gave him the opportunity to prepare and deliver a very able speech, though it was one with which I did not agree. The hon. gentleman also said I had chosen a very inopportune time for bringing this matter forward. I think it was a very opportune time; it was a comparison with one's year of depression, 1878, with another year of depression, 1884. If I had compared 1878 with 1883 I would have been told that I had taken a special year and that the comparison was not fair. The hon. gentleman said also that I was away from the country and therefore could not have known what was going on. In reply I can only say that if the hon. gentleman was himself in the country he must have closed his eyes and made very poor use of his time if he could not ascertain what was going on and see the progress of the country. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa made a very ungenerous speech; he could not deny the progress and the increased production of the country, and yet he would not give one single iota of credit to the party whose policy had caused the improvement, although on the other side we are prepared to allow the hon. gentleman and his party credit for all their acts, good or bad. The hon. gentleman alluded to the importations and exportations of the country as being in excess of what they were in former years. Is not that an evidence of wealth? If we have been able to consume the increased importations and the large home manufactures that is surely an evidence of increased wealth in the country. I will just tell hon. gentlemen what the difference has been in exports. It is something wonderful.

MON. MR. PLUMB—Oh, no, it is too late; hand the figures in to the reporter.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—The statement shows an excess during the five years that the National Policy has been in operation of $85,150,292. That is no evidence of poverty, and the imports have increased as well by $43,000,000 in the five years.

Total exports for the five years under Liberal Government	$392,681,048
Total exports under Conservative Government for five years, 1880 to 1884.	477,831,340

DOMINION IMPORTS.

1875	$123,070,283 00
1876	94,733,218 00
1877	96,300,483 00
1878	91,199,577 00
1879	81,964,427 00
	$487,267,988 00
1880	71,782,349 00
1881	105,330,840 00
1882	112,648,927 00
1883	132,254,022 00
1884	108,180.644 00
	$530,196,782 00

An increase of $42,928,794.00 imports in five years, under the National Policy, compared with five years under a revenue tariff.

As hon. gentlemen are so impatient, I will merely say, that those who have taken

the negative side and have chosen to be unbelievers on the question, have not succeeded in disproving any one of the statements made by these commissioners, or in refuting the arguments they have brought forward.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I think it is due to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, to say that his opening speech was compiled with great care, and contained much useful information. It has given rise to a most interesting, even if somewhat prolix, debate. I hope he will not consider that, because at this late hour we have become a little restless after hearing a very long speech, and many tedious readings in another quarter, and because I drew his attention to the fact that he had no right to reply, and was speaking entirely with the indulgence of the House, that I had not full appreciation of the value of the information which he has given us. For one, I thank the hon. gentleman very sincerely for having brought the question before the House. I declined to speak upon it, because it has been a subject of exhaustive discussions in another quarter, and in those discussions I took an active part there and on the hustings. There was nothing, and could be nothing, new in the general argument, to one who had watched very closely the whole of the National Policy debates and speeches for the last eight years. For that reason I did not feel inclined to take any part in the discussion here, but I was perfectly willing to listen, and I have remained, not without a trial of patience, here this evening to listen to arguments which contained nothing that I had not heard quite as forcibly stated often before; but I felt it due to the hon. gentleman, as I had suggested to him that he was making a speech which was a little out of order, to make this explanation, which I trust he will accept.

HON. MR. DEVER—I wish to make an explanation. The hon. gentleman from British Columbia is, certainly, entitled to our thanks for the manner in which he has brought—

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I rise to a question of order. This is not an explanation.

HON. MR. MACDONALD.

THE SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman is certainly out of order in what he is saying now. That is not an explanation.

HON. MR. DEVER—I may not have taken the proper course to make an explanation, but my object is to say that while the hon. gentleman from British Columbia is entitled to our thanks for the manner in which he has brought forward this question, I cannot agree with him—

HON. M. KAULBACH—I rise to a question of order. This is not an explanation.

HON. MR. SMITH—I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate adjourned at 11 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Wednesday, April 29th, 1885.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (S), "An Act to amend an Act respecting Offences against the Person."

HON. MR. GOWAN—I beg to move the adoption of the first and only amendment that I have to propose to this Bill, to strike out the words "and compellable" in the 11th line. I do so in deference to the strongly expressed opinion of my hon. friends opposite, who consider that it would be better not to compel the wife under such circumstances to give evidence. I myself am not very strongly struck with the force of the objection, but I do not think I would be justified in pressing it in the face of their opinion. Every member owes a debt to the pro-

fession to which he belongs, and my hon. friends opposite and myself are endeavoring to repay it by placing on the statute books, good laws and proper amendments to the existing laws and if there is not a complete accord between us on all points, I think we should always be prepared to give way.

HON. MR. DICKEY—May I be allowed to ask my hon. friend if that is the only amendment he proposes to make? On a former occasion, I suggested the desirability of permitting the husband to give evidence.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I myself did not propose to make any other amendment, but if hon. gentlemen desire to discuss the point, I should be happy to consider it. That is the only amendment I would, without hesitation, assent to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think the amendment suggested by my hon. friend from Amherst is necessary, because the Bill only relates to cases in which the husband fails to provide for his wife and family. There is no probability of an action being taken by the husband against the wife, so there is no room for such an amendment. I do not see how the husband could come in, in any way.

HON. MR. DICKEY—It may be a prosecution against the husband and the question is whether he should be allowed to be a witness. My hon. friend who has charge of this Bill is perfectly aware of the general rule with regard to the husband and wife—the general rule in criminal matters is that the husband and wife are not allowed to give evidence either for or against each other, for the reason that if they testify for each other their interests are identical. They are not allowed to give evidence against each other, on grounds of public policy, for fear of creating distrust and sowing dissensions between them, and occasioning perjury. That is the rule of the law. We have been pointed to an exception made by this parliament in 43 Vic., an Act respecting summary proceedings for common assault. In that Act there is a provision that the husband or wife shall be allowed to be a witness in such action. In analogous proceedings to this the husband is allowed to be a witness, and there is a provision also that the wife of the defendant shall be a competent witness on behalf of her husband, but there is no provision in that Act, as I read it, to make her a competent witness against her husband. In this Bill it is proposed, for the first time, to make the wife competent to give evidence against her husband. Now, that is a point very well worthy of being considered, because we had it up the other day. We should proceed very cautiously in these criminal matters. This is the first instance of this kind, as far as my experience goes—I may have overlooked some instances in our criminal legislation—except those cases in which the wife's evidence has always been allowed (such as adultery, or proceedings where the husband had used violence to her, where, from necessity, she might be a witness), on the ground *ex necessitate*. This Bill is contrary to all the previous precedents of our legislation, and I think the committee should pause before allowing such an enactment as this to make the wife a competent witness against her husband. I refer my hon. friend to the Act 43 Vic., where it is stated that in any such trial the wife or husband shall be a competent witness on behalf of the defendant—not against, but on behalf. In this Bill, it is stated that the wife shall be a competent witness in the prosecution on her own behalf; but it does not allow the husband to give testimony in his behalf. Surely he should be allowed to defend himself if the wife is allowed to be a witness against him. The precedents have only gone so far as to allow the wife to be a witness for her husband; if we allow her to give evidence against her husband, I think the husband should be allowed to be a witness on his own behalf.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I think my hon. friend is mistaken in supposing that it is the only case in which a wife may be called upon to give evidence against her husband. However, that scarcely touches the point in this case. The offence that this is intended to cover relates to an act, certainly not of violence against the wife, but of cruelly witholding from her the necessaries of life. There is a distinction between acts of feasance and of non-

feasance, and it was on that ground that the court held she was not a competent witness, the majority of the court differing from one of the learned judges before whom the question came up, who held that she was a competent witness, and that the Act would be futile and valueless—as I have already observed in moving the 2nd reading of the Bill—unless her evidence is admitted. I do not myself think the suggested amendment of the Bill is necessary. There is this, however, to be said in favor of what the hon. member from Amherst has referred to, and perhaps the only point to be said in its favor ; it may be that the husband is not in a position to procure the necessaries of life for his wife, and he may be the only person who could give full evidence on that point. That, it seems to me, is the only point in favor of the contention that he shall be allowed to give evidence on his own behalf. I do not myself think it necessary, but I am quite in the hands of the House. I do not desire to press any point that may not be thoroughly well founded. I am making an humble effort to improve the law in points where it has been pronounced to be quite defective by the highest judges in the land, and I am always glad and gratified to receive any assistance that can be given to it by those who have, as I have, only a desire to place on the statute book the best and most suitable laws for the circumstances of the case. If my hon. friend chooses to move an amendment in the direction he has indicated, he can do so, but I do not myself feel disposed to place it on the statute book.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—I hope the hon. member from Amherst will not move in the direction of allowing the defendant to give evidence in a case of this kind. I think we have gone far enough in allowing defendants in cases of assault and battery to give evidence. If we go further we may be in the position to which the hon. member from Halifax objected, with regard to a bill introduced the other day. It is rather going in that direction. I think the bill should be amended this far, that the evidence of the wife herself should not be sufficient alone to convict the husband. There should be some corroborative evidence to find the party guilty. But to allow the husband to give evidence in a matter of this kind, when he neglects a duty which is imposed upon him by every law, human and divine—to provide food and lodging and clothing for his wife and children—I do not think he is a right person to give evidence. As regards his not being able to provide for his wife, I think that fact might be easily proved apart from himself altogether. If he is a pauper, there are many means by which evidence of the fact could be given to the court, but I really hope the hon. member from Amherst will not move in the direction of allowing the defendant, in a case of this kind, to give evidence on his own behalf.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—The profession of which I have been long a member does not give me much knowledge of the law, but it gives one a knowledge of human nature. I am convinced that a woman bringing a case before a court against her husband, the moment she is allowed to give evidence, will give it in her husband's behalf. When he is charged with failing to provide her with clothing, she will be ready to say, "I have plenty of good clothes at home, and a first rate dress at the dressmaker's to be taken in or let out, as the case may be." I am not a chief justice, but I once saw a case which would serve as an illustration of this—that of a man who had shot his wife with a rifle. The ball had gone through her, and she ought to have died, but did not. He was prosecuted for the crime, and she came to me, asking me to try and get him off. I said, "he is a scoundrel, and ought to be punished." She said, "I know he is, but suppose he is sent to penitentiary for seven years, who will provide for my family?" I think the punishment provided by the Act which this Bill is intended to amend is imprisonment for three months in a workhouse. Will that enable the husband to give his wife better clothes, or is he more likely, when he is discharged from the workhouse, to supply them? I think not. If this Bill is passed, the poor woman will be worse off than she is, and I think it should be thrown out. If the hon. gentleman wishes to improve the laws, I will suggest an amendment. In the case I have mentioned I was examined as a witness ; I had been the medical attendant of the prisoner, and I was asked

if he had told me why he had shot his wife. I refused to answer, on the ground that any conversation I had with him was as a medical man. The judge said, "you are wrong; a medical man is bound to relate all he knows, and more than that, a priest or clergyman is obliged to relate what is told him, even in the confessional." Whatever the law may be, I knew that common sense was against it, and I was not afraid at all of being compelled; but I asked the judge on that occasion, and I ask the hon. member from Barrie, why, if a lawyer cannot be made to tell what his client has said to him, the same privilege is not extended to clergymen and doctors? I trust that the hon. gentleman will give them the same privilege that the law now grants to the lawyer.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I do not concur altogether in the view of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. The hon. member who introduced this Bill does not speak as an advocate or counsel, but from a much higher standpoint—as a judge who has been for 40 years entrusted with the administration of the laws. During a long and very active life, in which he has acquired a very valuable training for making the laws of the country, he has discovered that there are certain defects in the laws, which should be remedied. No one supposes that our laws are perfect, even when they are consolidated. The laws of the country are perpetually changing, as experience dictates, from time to time, and it is really only from experience that one can judge what is best to be adopted. I feel that it is not wise to depart from the maxim *festina lente*, particularly in laws of this kind, but, no doubt, experience is the most valuable educator in furnishing improvements, more particularly in the criminal laws. The suggestion made by the hon. member from Lunenburg, is, I think, the correct one—that is, that no conviction should be complete on the evidence of the wife alone. It should be supported by corroborative testimony. It is the invariable practice of judges to hear the statement of the husband in such cases. He does not make it under oath, but he is allowed to make it to the court. He is always catechised as to why he has failed to support his wife or child, and the case is not exactly as my hon. friend from Amherst has put it, because it is not a complaint of the wife alone, but it is the wife and child, or children. Those children may be of such tender years that they cannot be examined, and I am disposed to believe that there are not many cases in which the wife complains against the husband where there are no children As far as my own observation goes, when women who have no children to support are abandoned by their husbands, or their husbands refuse to support them, they generally rely upon their own exertions, and are able to support themselves; but when there are minor childern, perhaps it becomes an unfair tax on the wife, and she naturally appeals to the laws of the country to enforce the obligations which her husband assumed to support his family. I think, therefore, the suggestion of my hon. friend is a very proper one, that no prosecution should be permitted under this Bill on the unsupported testimony of the wife, but that her evidence should receive such substantial corroborative evidence as the courts may think necessary. With those words added I think the danger would be averted, and this very useful provision, removing the question of doubt as to whether the wife is a competent witness, might become law. There is no one so well fitted as the wife to explain to the court and jury, if necessary, what the neglect complained of has been. Very often no neighbor is cognizant of the facts. Take the case of a family who live isolated from neighbors. How can they know whether the husband turns his wife out of doors or fails to provide her with food? In such cases it is extremely difficult to procure a conviction. A father may be guilty of acts of tyranny which should subject him to punishment, but unless there are grown up children there are no witnesses. Where they are of tender years, say under eight or nine, they are not eligible as witnesses, and therefore this sort of treatment may go on for years, and be utterly incapable of proof unless the evidence of the wife is admitted. We know the tendency of all judicial minds, and in fact of every fair mind, is to heal up domestic difficulties. It is not desirable that a wife should have resort to an action of this kind, and it is the experience of courts that it is infinitely better in such cases to postpone the hearing. I

know that the feelings of judges, who have had such cases before them, is to suggest that some other reference should be made, and that the wife and husband should not quarrel, at the same time intimating to the husband what his legal responsibilities are, and what would be the consequence of a continuance of refusing to support his wife and children. Therefore, we need not be at all uneasy that the judges will hastily punish the husband unless there is such strong testimony as makes it clear that he should be punished—having the means at his disposal to support his wife and minor children, and wilfully refusing to do so. For these reasons, I would be disposed to believe that the amendments proposed by the hon. member from Lunenburg would remove any objection that otherwise would be made to the Bill.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The principle of the Bill was adopted at the second reading, I take it, and it seems to me that the committee have agreed upon one point, that is that the wife shall not be compellable to give evidence. I think it might be as well to make the amendment which has been suggested by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill first, and then consider the other question as to whether the husband should be a competent witness or not. I agree with the hon. member from Amherst that he should, but we might make the amendment that we all agree to first.

The amendment was adopted.

Hon. Mr. GOWAN—Having heard what my hon. friends on the other side have said, I must say I do not think that I would be justified in resisting the proposition made by my hon. friend from Lunenburg, that some testimony in corroboration of the wife's should be heard, but beyond that I do not feel disposed to go. I think it would be unwise to allow the husband to be admitted as a witness in the matter, and I think it would be opening the door to a very objectionable practice. My hon. friend, the junior member from Halifax (Mr. Almon) seems to consider that members of the profession to which I belong are utterly incapable of forming any judgment whatever with respect to the matters on which he touched; that we have no opportunities of doing so, and that we are incapable, in fact, of forming an opinion upon them had we such opportunities. No doubt he is thinking that as certain trades render men liable to certain diseases so a certain course of life renders men liable to fall into wrong impressions on various subjects; but with respect to the profession to which I have the honor to belong, I beg to inform him that he is quite mistaken. Lawyers have very nearly, if not quite, as good opportunities of forming a judgment as medical men. The hon. gentleman has constantly referred to matters touching members of the profession, and perhaps he has not quite studied some of the peculiarities of his own profession—an honorable profession of which, I believe, he is a distinguished member—but they occasionally fall into errors like other men. Now, I know as a fact, from reading and from my own observation, that they form certain theories—they receive a little light and get enamoured of their own conception; they form theories and generalize them and apply them to every case. I remember, it is not long ago, that a physician pronounced every disease which came under his notice was suppressed gout. If a man had a pain in his elbow it was suppressed gout; if a man had a boil on his back it was suppressed gout. My hon. friend the junior member from Halifax, is not exactly, perhaps, in favor of that view, that suppressed gout applies to every case, but he is quite a believer of the view that suppressed Scott Act applies to every Bill. His remarks to-day, and on the motion for the second reading of this Bill, pointed to the Scott Act, so, really, he has a certain moral disease—I say it with all respect—which is suppressed Scott Act.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—I wish it were suppressed.

Hon. Mr. GOWAN—I should like to hear the amendment, if the hon. member from Lunenburg will kindly formulate it.

Hon Mr. KAULBACH—I move that the following be added to the end of the clause, "In all such prosecutions, the evidence of the wife alone shall not be sufficient as against her husband."

HON. MR. GOWAN—I accept that.

HON. MR. POWER — Before that amendment is moved, I propose another which would render that unnecessary if it carried. The section of the Act of 1869, which my hon. friend proposes to amend, provides that whoever, being legally liable to provide for any person, wife. child, &c., necessary food, clothing or lodging, and without any lawful excuse, refuses or neglects to provide the same, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, &c. Now, hon. gentlemen will see that the offence set out here is not in the nature of what is commonly regarded as a crime ; it is simply the neglect of the husband to perform a duty which, as a husband, he is bound to perform ; and it is really, as I said when the Bill was at its second reading, to all intents and purposes, a civil action to compel the husband to do this, and, in addition, to punish him for not doing it. Where the husband and wife fall out, and their relations become such that the wife brings a criminal prosecution against her husband for not providing for herself and her children, the woman must have lost the feelings which ordinarily actuate wives towards their husbands, and, instead, probably feelings of bitter hostility fill her mind and her heart, I think that the wife in such cases is very likely to be an exceedingly unscrupulous witness. Now, here is the husband accused of having neglected to supply the necessaries of life for his wife. It may be simply that he and she have had a quarrel and she is very angry and bound to make him suffer. She comes into court and tells her story under oath. If you allow her to tell her side of the story, the husband should be allowed to come in and tell his. I think that is a perfectly fair and reasonable proposition. Where a man is charged with adultery his evidence is admitted, and I think that as this is a case of failure to discharge his duty as a husband in another way, his evidence should be admitted also, as it is in the other case. I propose by this amendment to strike out all the words after "child" in the 10th line, and insert the following instead : "the accused and his wife shall be competent to give evidence either for or against the accused."

HON. MR. KAULBACH—My hon. friend will see that by the amendment which I have proposed the evidence of the wife will not alone be sufficient. That will accomplish what he wants by his amendment. There must be other evidence besides that of the wife, and, really, if the facts are I said before, that the husband is such a brute as to refuse to supply his wife—

HON. MR. POWER—My hon. friend has prejudged the case, as a jury might do. They make up their minds that the husband is a brute before they have heard his story, and that is why I think he should be allowed to state his case.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—They come to the conclusion from evidence in addition to the statement of the wife. I should be sorry to go any further to allow the defendant in a prosecution to give evidence. I think it is dangerous legislation.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I am very glad to find that the suggestion which I made to the hon. member in charge of this Bill has been received by him in a proper spirit. My object, equally with his, is to secure good legislation. The only Act that has been referred to which has made an exception to the rule I have mentioned is the 43 Vic., which applies to cases of common assault and battery. In such cases you allow the wife to be a witness for the husband and the husband to be a witness for himself, but there is nothing said about the wife being a witness against her husband. Now, as far as that goes, I stated the only ground upon which it could be allowed, as I thought, was from the necessity of the case. If, *ex necessitate*, that provision is required that the wife shall be allowed to be a witness against her husband with regard to this matter for not providing food and clothing, let it be so. For my own part, I am willing to give way on that point if the hon. gentleman will put the two parties on the same footing—in the same position that they occupy in the Act 43 Vic. That is all I ask, and I have not as yet heard a single reason why the husband should be placed in a worse position than the wife. It is quite true, as the hon. member from Lunenburg explained, that his amendment does, to a

certain extent, meet the difficulty, because it requires corroborative evidence, but at the same time my hon. friend will see that the mouth of the husband is shut by this Bill. He allows the wife to tell her story, but will not allow the husband. There is no fair play in that, and there is no reason why we should not legislate in exactly the same lines as we did on assault and battery, and allow both parties to tell their stories. I really do not see why that should not be done. If my hon. friend will take that course I for one shall be perfectly willing to abandon the objection I have to the wife giving evidence against her husband. That is met by the amendment of my hon. friend from Lunenburg, but the husband should be put, as a witness, on exactly the same footing as the wife.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I must say that I think the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Lunenburg completely meets the whole case, and I should be unwilling to allow the entering wedge of permitting a party liable to be indicted for a misdemeanor—because it is a misdemeanor by the statute for which he is liable to three years imprisonment—to give evidence on his own behalf. It is true there is a distinction between this and other cases, the charge being one of omission and not of commission, but still the principle is the same, and the same rule which would apply to one case would also apply to the other. I accept the amendment of the hon. member from Lunenburg, and I think it will really cover all that is necessary to provide for the security of a person indicted on such a charge. He requires that the evidence of the wife shall, in effect, be corroborated—that no man shall be convicted on the unsupported evidence of his wife.

The amendment to the amendment (Mr. Power's) was declared lost, and the original amendment was adopted.

HON. MR. DEVER, from the committee, reported the Bill as amended.

HON. MR. GOWAN moved concurrence in the amendments.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I would suggest that as the amendments are material, it would be better to postpone concurrence in the report of the committee until to-morrow, in order that members may have an opportunity of considering the Bill in its present shape.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I move that the amendments be taken into consideration to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES AFFECTING ANIMALS BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (41), "An Act respecting Infectious or Contagious Diseases affecting Animals." He said: This Bill is to make some changes of no very great importance in the Act respecting contagious diseases affecting animals, amendments which have been found by experience to be desirable in the interest of the protection of the general flocks and herds of the country, against infectious diseases.

HON. MR. POWER—After the very lucid and elaborate explanation of the provisions of this Bill made by the Minister, there can be no hesitation on the part of the House in adopting it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I will explain it all in committee.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AND LIQUOR LICENSE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

ORDER OF THE DAY POSTPONED.

The order of the day having been called that the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole on Bill (92), "An Act further to amend the Canada Temperance Act 1878, and the Liquor License Act 1883"—

HON. MR. VIDAL said: I have just received from our colleague, the Hon.

Mr. Flint, whose interest in this matter we all appreciate, a request that, if possible, the putting of the House into committee on this Bill be deferred until to-morrow, and I therefore move that the order of the day be discharged, and that the Bill be referred to committee of the whole to-morrow.

HON. MR. POWER—I would like to suggest this; that the amendments of which I have given notice, should be moved when the order of the day is called, and it may be there will be some discussion on that, and after that discussion we will go into committee on the Bill, and the hon. gentleman from Belleville will then have an opportunity of being present when the Bill is being discussed in committee.

THE SPEAKER—I take it for granted that the calling of the order of the day means putting the question before the House. There is no motion before the House now until the order of the day is put before the House by motion.

HON. MR. DICKEY—That has been the usual practice, I think, to make a motion, but really after all it is not of much consequence. I put it to my hon. friend whether under the circumstance of the committee being put off, as that has been so cordially responded to on this side of the House, he will be ready with the Bill, in its future stages, to have a full consideration of it. He has met us in the same spirit from the beginning in this Bill, and I should certainly support him in this motion to postpone the order of the day under the circumstances. I do not understand my hon. friend from Halifax to object to that at all; he merely objects to the mode of proceeding.

HON. MR. ALMON—I do not think it is wise to postpone the consideration of the Bill. I shall be very happy to pair off with the hon. member from Belleville, as far as the voting is concerned.

HON. MR. VIDAL—It is not the mere pairing off on the vote; the hon. gentleman from Belleville wishes to address the House, and I am afraid that my hon. friend opposite will hardly represent him in that respect.

The motion was agreed to and the order of the day was discharged.

The Senate adjourned at 4.20 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, April 30th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

BILL INTRODUCED.

"An Act respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

TREATIES WITH THE INDIANS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

INQUIRY.

HON. MR. READ rose to call the attention of the Government to the treaties made with the Indians in the North-West, and ask if it is the intention to make any further treaties of the same nature?

He said: I have been led to give notice of this motion from certain discussions in the public press of the country, in relation to the Indians and the troubles in the North-West. After the able address that was delivered to us by the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg, lately, I suppose there is not much to be said as to the condition of the Indians; but we must be quite aware that our relations with the Indians in the North-West at the present time are engaging the public mind to a very great extent. I was led to look into this matter from a statement of a very extraordinary nature that appeared in one of the leading journals of this country, the Toronto *Globe*. I thought it was not possible that such a statement could have been made by the gentleman to whom it is attributed; and for fear that I should not do him justice, I wrote to him on Monday and have his reply. I think it is as well to read what he is reported to have said and then give his answer. The

gentleman is the Rev. E. R. Young, and the statement to which I refer appears in a report of a lecture delivered by him in the Bloor street Methodist Church, Toronto. When we see in a paper like the *Globe*, a statement purporting to have been made in a Wesleyan Church, in Toronto, we are likely to believe that it was made as represented. However, I could not conceive that it was possible such an assertion could have been made, and I will read for the information of the House what Mr. Young is reported to have said :—

"Those men who had been sent out to deal with the Indians had tried to make as good a thing out of it as possible for themselves while there.

"Within the past few years the country has spent over a million dollars on the Indians. Allowing that there were 33,000 Indians in the North-West, this amounted to about $30 per head. But the Indians only received $5 per head, and the country had been paying $25 a head per Indian to the officials who distributed this allowance."

This quotation is embodied in an editorial based on the report of the lecture, published the day before. I asked myself, can it be possible that such a statement was made? I am well acquainted with the gentleman who is said to have made the statement. He is a minister of my own church, and he has lived eight or nine years in the North-West. I wrote him a letter asking him if the statement that I had seen in the report of his speech in the *Globe* of Friday was substantially correct. His reply I will read to the House ; it is as follows :—

"In reply, I beg leave to state that the report of my lecture in the *Globe* of last Friday is about as correct as such reports generally are, which is not saying a great deal. The leaving out of a great deal, and the putting of such a sentence as that about the Indians only getting $5 per head, and the country paying $25 a head per Indian to those who distribute this allowance, is very misleading."

That is all he said on that question. I have looked into the papers since to see if over his own signature he has denied the statement, and I have not been able to find that he has done so through the press. If he did not make the statement that was published in the *Globe*, I think he ought to deny it. The rev. gentleman knew what he was talking about, because he stated the number of Indians there were in the North-West, or about the number, and he also knew the amount of money the country was expending. It amounts to $33.50 per head for each Indian man, woman, and child that receives assistance under the treaties.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—In what way? Per annum?

Hon. Mr. READ—Yes, $33.50 per head is the amount paid by the country per annum. This gentleman states in his letter the amount of money which is expended. He has evidently taken it from the Public Accounts, because he says the actual figures are $1,025,605.80, and of this large sum he says the Indians only receive the sum of $170,749.50. I cannot find there is any truth in that statement. I cannot charge him with saying anything more, only when people lecture in a church where their statements cannot be confronted it is well that they should at least know what they are talking about, especially when they are dealing with such subjects as this ; because if this report in the *Globe* were read to the Indians in the North-West in their present excited state, and they were told that the press of the country was saying that the distribution of the Indian money cost $25 a head, while the Indians are only getting $5, it would be very apt to excite them, especially if there was any truth in it. It would be well to consider where this money goes. I think, from everything I can gather, having taken some pains to look into this matter, it has been rightly expended. If there was any dereliction of duty, or if any direct charge could be brought against any of the officials under the Government, it would be the duty of the Government to investigate it at once. But these statements go abroad and people are led to think that possibly there may be some truth in them, unless they are denied. I think that is a sufficient reason, if there was nothing more, to bring this matter before the House and the country, because, before I am through, I will show where this money goes and will prove that this $1,000,000 money is not thrown away upon officials, but that it is honestly distributed amongst the Indians.

INDIAN EXPENDITURE, 1884.

Annuities	$170,749 50
Agricultural Implements	22,172 69
Tools	3,589 28
Cattle	15,459 75
Seed grain	10,786 45
Ammunition and Twine	7,770 70
Provisions for use during annuity payments	48,269 20
Provisions for destitute Indians	499,325 50
Clothing	4,906 50
Schools	12,133 40
Surveys	19,443 09
Farm Wages	44,023 95
Farm Maintenance	27,007 12
Scow	459 63
General Expenses	117,314 34
Commissioners, House and Office	10,135 67
Industrial Schools	12,018 93
	$1,025,678 68

We have entered into seven treaties with the Indians since we acquired the North-West Territories. The first was made with the Ojibways and Swampy Crees by Mr. Simpson, Mr. Dawson and Mr. Robt. Pether. By that treaty each family received 160 acres of land, and the Government agreed to maintain schools, to prohibit liquor on the reserves, and to give an annuity of $3 per head and a present of an equal amount per year. The second treaty was made by Mr. Simpson, Lieut.-Governor Archibald and Mr. McKay. The terms were very much the same as in the former one. The Indians had the opportunity of hunting and fishing, and they lived in a country where game abounded. Subsequently, after other treaties had been made, the terms of these two were reconsidered and amended on the 30th April, 1875, to conform to more recent ones, and the annuity was increased to $5 per head, and other things in proportion. The chief gets $25, each head man $15, Indians $5 each, and amongst other things schools are maintained on the reserve. The next treaty, No. 3, is known as the North-West Angle Treaty. The commissioners were Governor Morris, J. N. Provencher, and S. J. Dawson. It was with the Ojibways, and the terms were, a square mile for each family, a present of $12 to each person at the signing of the treaty, schools to be maintained on the reserves, the sale of liquor to be prohibited, each Indian to receive $5 annually, and $1,500 a year to be divided amongst them in ammunition and twine, and also tools and implements were to be delivered, seed grain, a yoke of oxen, a bull and four cows; each chief received $25 a year, each head man $15, and each member of the tribe $5. This treaty, No. 3, is called the Model Treaty; the four treaties made afterwards were of the same character. The fourth treaty was made with the Salteaux and Assiniboines, on the 15th of September, 1874, the commissioners being Governor Morris, Governor Laird and Wm. J. Christie. Each family of five was to receive a mile square of land, and where the family was larger than five, the quantity was increased proportionately. The annuities paid to the chiefs, headmen and members of the tribe were the same as in treaty No. 3. Treaty No. 5 was with the Salteaux and Swampy Crees. The commissioners were Lt.-Governor Morris, Hon. James McKay and Mr. Christie. Treaty No. 6 is the Carleton and Pitt Treaty. This is where we have the present difficulties. The treaty was made in August, 1876, by Governor Morris, Hon. George McKay and Hon. Wm. Joseph Christie—I think he was the agent of the Hudson Bay Company in that locality.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, he was.

HON. MR. READ—By that treaty each family of five was to have a mile square of land, each Indian received $12 at the signing of the treaty, schools were to be maintained, liquor to be prohibited, and $1,500 worth of useful articles to be distributed each year; but there is nothing in all these treaties about supplying food. and when we come to look into it, we will see what is the explanation of it, because a shorthand reporter was present at the conference, and took down everything that was said by the Indians and the commissioners. This treaty was with the Plains and Woods Crees and some of the Stony tribes. The last treaty, No. 7, was made on the 22nd of September, 1877, the commissioners being Governor Laird and J. F. McLeod. It was made with the Blackfeet, the Piegans, the Sarcees and other tribes close to the international boundary, and near the Rocky Mountains, They were to have a mile square of land for each family of five, $12 each at the signing of the treaty, $25 for each chief per annum, $15 for each head man, and

$5 for every other member of the tribe. They were to be supplied with other articles in the same manner as the Indians under the other treaties.

HON. MR. O'DONOHOE—How much tobacco constitutes a present—how many pounds?

HON. MR. READ—I have not the information as regards the present of tobacco at all. I have read over all the reports of the treaties and the public accounts, and I do not see anything that will give me that information.

Now, what are we doing? Are we carrying out our agreements with the Indians? From the Public Accounts, and from all the information I can get, we are doing so to a much greater extent than ever was expected—certainly to a greater extent than the terms of the treaties demand. At the present time, and for some years, we have been spending about a million dollars annually. It was not quite so much five or six years ago, and I think it was a little more than a million, a year or so ago. At all events, it is now $1,025,000. How has that money been expended? The Indians are distributed as follows:—

Treaty No	Chiefs.	Headmen.	Indians.
1	9	33	3,323
2	6	25	864
3	29	83	2,493
4	35	96	5,614
5	10	27	3,118
6	39	135	7,983
7	9	46	6,616
	137	448	30,011

In all 30,011 that received $5 per head; 448 headmen, who received $15 each; and 137 chiefs, who received $25 each per annum. Each chief every three years had a suit of clothes given him. I do not know whether the headmen get clothing in the same way.

The industrial schools, I may say, are for the instruction of Indian boys, and others who wish to learn trades, such as blacksmithing, shoemaking, carpentering, &c., which will enable them to earn their living. Many of the articles which the Indians receive are specified in the treaties, such as oxen and cows, and our agreements were made to give them more where ranching could be carried on, and less stock in parts of the country not so well suited for cattle raising; but each band received a yoke of oxen, a bull and three or four cows, etc. I think that is one of the reasons why the expenditures a year or two ago were more than they are now. I have looked through the accounts and it appears to me they are all regular. If the money has gone in an improper manner there is no evidence of it. Everything is expensive in that country, no doubt, but still the system that the Government have inaugurated is one that any business man would have adopted, and if there was anything wrong it would soon be found out. The Government get most of their supplies by contract. Advertisements are published in the press throughout the country calling for tenders, and there is a great deal of competition. Every one knows how anxious people are to deal with the Government, because if the prices are at all reasonable, the money being certain the contract is generally profitable. The contractor delivers his supplies to the Indian agents, at the different agencies. The receipt of the agent is taken in each case, upon which the contractor receives his pay. After that, each agent distributes to the different farm instructors in his agency, and each farm instructor has to give a receipt for everything he gets, and has to show what becomes of the supplies. I think that is a sufficient check. I cannot conceive why, if anything should go wrong, it would be anywhere but with the farm instructor who lives amongst the Indians. If he has pork and flour, and other supplies to sell it will soon be found out. The Indians would see it. His accounts have to be correct, and he is the only man who is responsible for their accuracy. I doubt if there is much dishonesty. The farm instructor may use some of the supplies; but he cannot sell them, and I do not see how the accounts can go far astray. But, besides that, there is a rigid inspection every year. The accounts are inspected and checked, and they have to correspond as regularly as any merchant's books must balance, and if there is anything wrong it is rectified at once. That, I think, is a sufficient guarantee to the country that at least the food is distributed properly, and in a business-

like manner. We cannot say that two thousand miles from here nothing is wrong, but every precaution is evidently taken that food and supplies are distributed properly. If the farm instructor does not do so, the starving Indians, seeing him in possession of supplies of pork and flour, would soon take steps to have their grievances redressed. I do not know that more precaution could be taken. We see things hinted at here and there, but why do not people make a specific charge? I was in conversation last year with a gentleman, in the Russell House, who travels a great deal, a very important man in this country, who knows what he is talking about. He told me a great many stories—that he had seen pork at Fort McLeod that was rotten, and was not fit for use.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—That was last September?

HON. MR. READ—Yes; that he had seen rotten pork, diseased pork, and everything of that sort. I did not ask him then where it was, but to-day I met him on the street, and he said to me very jocularly "this is the gentleman who thinks the Indians are not cheated." I said, "I do not know; I have yet to have evidence of it. Can you tell me where you saw food issued to the Indians that was not fit for use?" He said "Yes." I asked "Where?" He said "Fort McLeod." I asked "When?" He said "Last September." That was a plain statement. I made it my business then to enquire about it—in fact I went to the office—and I have a letter here from the Inspector which it will be well to read. The Inspector said that "there is a rigid inspection of the food every year; I have heard nothing about this case, but this is a specific charge, giving a specific time and a specific place, and I will make enquiries." He did so and the result he gives in this letter:—

OTTAWA, 30th April, 1885.

SIR,—Referring to that portion of my annual report, at page 143 of the printed Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for 1884, I have the honor to state that I inspected the several agencies in Treaty No. 7, in July and August 1884, and that I found all the provisions on hand of excellent quality. The bacon on hand at Fort MacLeod, and at the Blackfoot Crossing, is a portion of 120,000 lbs. delivered under contract in November, 1883.

I happened to be in Treaty No. 7 when the bacon was being delivered, and am able to say, positively, that it was of as fine a quality of clear side bacon as it was possible to furnish—in fact it was of the very best quality.

Up to the date of my last inspection, it had not appreciably deteriorated in quality, a fact of which I satisfied myself but cutting into every tenth side inspected, finding the meat firm and the fat sweet and white.

The condition of the bacon in question was found to be the same at all the points in treaty 7, where it was stored.

I am also able to state from personal knowledge that all the beef supplied to the Indians of that Treaty is of excellent quality, the animals killed being fat steers of from three to seven years old.

(Signed) T. P. WADSWORTH,
Inspector of Indian Agencies,
N. W. T.

L. VANKOUGHNET, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs.

That, I think, disposes of those bold statements that people make. There is nothing like pinning them right down when we find them. The people know that they are expending a large amount for those Indians; they expend it willingly, and when statements like this are made—that the Canadian people provide the means to supply the Indians with food, which the officers appointed to distribute it amongst them turn to their own use, while the Indians are starving, and that is the cause of this uprising—it should not go uncontradicted, if it is untrue. While it is generally supposed that the Indians are not very sharp in making their bargains, it will be seen that in all those treaties they made very large demands on the Commissioners, and asked that they should be fed. It is evident that Chief Beardy has been a troublesome Indian from the commencement. The year before this treaty was made with them, the Rev. George Macdougal was requested by the Government to visit all the tribes and notify them that the following year a treaty would be made with them for their lands. He had been a missionary among the Indians for several years, and was frozen to death on the plains the year after this treaty. He notified all the Indians in the North-West that the Commissioners would be there the following year, to make a treaty with them. When they came near the Duck Lake district,

Chief Beardy was very troublesome. The Commissioners had appointed Carlton as the place at which the treaty would be made, but Beardy pointed out another place; he said he had a vision that the treaty was to be made on such a hill, and not at Carlton. The Commissioners did not approve of it, and went on to Carlton, and he did not attend at the treaty. Then the Commissioners sent a messenger to him, and he states the circumstance as follows:—

"I sent a messenger, Mr. Peter Ballenden, to Duck Lake, to inform the Indians that I would meet them at the encampment of the Carlton Crees, about two miles from the Fort. On the 17th, on his return, he informed me that the Chief said, "he had not given me leave to meet the Indians anywhere except at Duck Lake, and that they would only meet me there."

Beardy did come in, I believe, finally, and joined in the treaty, but he has been a troublesome Indian, When the telegraph people were going through that country he unloaded their carts and threw their stuff away, and the Government had to pay the contractors some $600 for damages. He has always been troublesome. It is as well to read a little from the report of what was said at that treaty. They asked that food should be given to them. The report says:—

"A spokesman, the Pond Maker, then addressed me, and asked assistance when they settled on the land, and further help as they advanced in civilization. I replied that they had their own means of living, and that we could not feed the Indians, but only assist them to settle down. The Badger, Soh-ah-moos, and several other Indians all asked help when they settled, and also in case of unforseen troubles in the future. I explained that we could not assume the charge of their everyday life, but in a time or a great national calamity they could trust to the generosity of the Queen."

In all the correspondence there never were any hopes held out to them that they were to be fed. There was a short-hand reporter there, and everything was taken down that was said. And in no part of the report will it be found that the Commissioner held out to the Indians any hope that they were to be fed by the Government. Now, what are we doing? In addition to giving them farm implements and instructors, and furnishing them with seed and industrial schools and cattle and all those things, we have been spending half a million of dollars annually for food, and that food is distributed in this manner:—There are certain reserves where pork is distributed, and other reserves where beef is given. The latter are in the ranche country, to the south west where they have been in the habit of using beef or buffalo meat altogether, and there the Indians are fed with beef. There has been some little trouble about some pork having been sent there. The Indians for a time did not like the pork; but they want a ration of pork once a week now. There was some little jarring at that time, but since it was discovered the commissioners had given them beef. They give each Indian a pound of beef a day, and half a pound of flour under Treaty No. 7, for every man, woman and child. It is issued three times a week. The system is to give the food to the aged and infirm and the widows and orphans regularly—all those who cannot help themselves. But the Indian that will not do anything on his own land, or do anything to support himself and his family, the farm instructor is directed not to give him rations. If the Indian works on his own land, and does something towards earning his own living, then he receives his rations for himself and his family the same as the others in the tribe. Those are the instructions to farm instructors, and I cannot tell you how they are carried out. The instructions seem to be reasonable, and it does not seem to be any cause for this rising. The Indian is given oxen and a plough, and seed grain and implements and cows, and he has his land to work, and if he will only do something towards earning his own living and cultivating the soil, he gets his rations regularly. The Indians in the Edmonton and Fort Pitt district get a pound of flour per day and one-third of a pound of pork for each man, woman and child. That seems to be a very fair ration when it includes every little papoose. This bacon that is distributed is all meat and no bone, and I think that amount of food is quite sufficient for the Indians to subsist on. That is the condition of affairs, and we cannot conceive that there is any real cause for this uprising. No doubt the Indians have been misled. We cannot divest ourselves of the idea that they are children to a certain extent; that they are easily led

away, that they have not the foresight that other people have to provide for the future. The British Government have always, since they have had anything to do with the Indians of this country, made it part of their policy to take care of them and to protect them, and up to the present time we do not know of any difficulty that has arisen under that policy. We find them in the war of 1812 fighting side by side with the whites against the enemies of England, and up to the present time I do not think we have had any difficulty with them, and would not to-day if they had not been badly advised. I hope the time will soon arrive when they will peaceably take to their reserves and devote themselves to the cultivation of their lands and try to support themselves. It is a serious question what we are to do with the Indians, and it is one that has to be met by Parliament. I do not advocate feeding men who are not willing to do anything for themselves—able-bodied men who could work if they wished to do so. The Rev. Mr. Young, who has been referred to, has lived amongst the Indians for a number of years, and he advises that they should be all moved to the north, towards the Beren's River. I should like to see the Government try to drive those people to the north—to drive them away from where they were born and brought up, and their fathers before them! If they were driven north, I do not think they could be kept there very long. Mr. Young says 200 policemen would be able to take care of them if they were all put together in the north. However, I think they will find it a difficult matter to keep them there; they would be like a flock of sheep. When one would break out the rest would follow. In the spring of the year the farm instructors are authorized to give the Indians who will work on their land tobacco and tea. That is a present to encourage them to provide for themselves. It might be well perhaps for hon. gentlemen to hear what is the cost of this food that is provided in the different localities. It is no secret, but many would be surprised to learn how expensive it is:

TREATY NO. 4.

	Flour.	Beef.	Bacon.
Birtle	.04c.		.16c.
Indian Head ..	.02⅞		.14½

TREATY NO. 6.

Prince Albert..	.03	.17½
Carlton	.03½	.17¾
Battleford	.04¼	.18
Pitt	.05¾	.18¾
Snake Hills....	.06 9/10	.18¾
Edmonton	.06½	.18 7/10
Peace Hills....	.06¼	.18½

TREATY NO. 7.

Blood Reserve....	.04¼c.	.11½c.	.15 9/10
Piegan Reserve...	.04¼	.11½	.15 9/10
Blackfoot Reserve.	.03⅛	.11½	.14 7/10
Sarcee Reserve...	.03¼	.12	.14 9/10

Those seem to be very high prices, but everything in that country is expensive, and has to be paid for at high prices. No doubt, in the near future, this will be changed as the country is settled and farm produce becomes more plentiful and the Indians raise more produce of their own, and the Government will be able to give them more food for the same amount of money. I have often wondered why it is that in the North-West country, where grain is so plentiful and so cheap, the farmers have not taken to raising pork more than they have done. However, they manage their own business, and I cannot manage it for them. This Indian question is of vast importance now, and if I have detained the House a little by my remarks I hope hon. gentlemen will excuse me. It is desirable to have the information which is the subject of my inquiry, and I will conclude by asking the Government whether they intend to make any more treaties in the North-West of the same nature as those which have been made up to the present time?

HON. MR. OGILVIE—Before anything further is said, I would like to confirm a great many of the statements of the hon. member from Belleville. There was a difficulty about bacon and pork at the Blood reserve just about the time I was there, in August. I then saw good bacon, meat that any of us would be glad to have on our tables, distributed to the Indians, and I have seen the Indian chiefs look at it and pitch it contemptuously away from them, saying, "no good, no good."

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Where was that?

HON. MR. OGILVIE—That was on the Blood Reserve. I have seen the beef distributed to them, and if there was anything wrong with the smallest piece of it, they would not take it, and they acted very badly indeed. They get good provisions, and from what I saw while out there of the agents who are doing the work, they did it well and honestly. They had a kind of stockade built, to which the Indians had access through a narrow passage way, made with heavy posts, through which one man could go at a time. They tried to get me to go in through it, but I could not; it was too narrow, and the Indians laughed at me. The beef is cut in pieces, weighed, and given out to the Indians, and they take it away with them. They get first-rate rations indeed, and are treated a great deal better than most of our laboring men in this part of the country.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—The trouble is they are fed too well.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I have been on several of the reserves myself, and from what I have seen I have come to the conclusion, that, if they had not been treated so well as they have been, we would not have so much trouble from them to-day. The hon. member from Belleville spoke of Fort McLeod Indians. Those we saw about Fort McLeod were few in number, and they had just as good rations there as the Mounted Police had—nothing could be better. In my opinion, this rebellion has originated in a desire to get possession of the country. The Indians have been led to believe, and I have known it for months, that if they can once get possession of it again, they can hold it forever.

HON. MR. FLINT—I have been acquainted with the rev. gentleman who has been accused of making the statement which appeared in the *Globe*, from his boyhood, and I know him almost as well as I know anyone. I believe him to be a man of honor and integrity, and I know that he must have made a great sacrifice when he gave up a comfortable home to go into the North-West country amongst the Indians, where he remained eight or nine years, endeavoring to do them all the good he possibly could, and I do not believe that he is a man who would make a statement at variance with the truth. I think, in whatever statements he has made, he has been influenced by a desire to do what is right, and I hold in my hand a letter of his, which is published in the *Methodist Magazine*, of Toronto, for May. With the permission of the House I should like to read it. I think it is no more than fair to the rev. gentleman that he should be put in a right position. I do not believe in the *Globe* myself. I do not believe much of anything I see in its columns. Its object seems to be to do all the damage it can to the present Government, by publishing articles that will have a bad effect upon them. This letter by the Rev. Mr. Young, is as follows:—

"The Indian question has suddenly come to the front, and, as is quite natural, a large number of persons are emerging from the obscurity where they had, according to their own imagination, been reading the 'signs of the times,' and with their 'I told you so,' and 'I had long foreseen this," and 'the Government ought to have done this,' or 'it ought not to have done that,' are adding to the agony of the occasion, and making matters more mixed and confusing to a long-suffering, patient reading public, who patriotically wade through their effusions.

"It is said that the author of 'Life on the Ocean Wave,' never went to sea, and that he who wrote 'Do they miss me at home?' never left home. So the less some people know about a thing the more assurance with which they write about it.

"At the earnest request of the editor, I add my share to this generous dish of Olla Podrida, not that I profess to know more than what has been written, but from the fact of having been within a few hundred miles of the scene of conflict, and having had a partial acquaintance with some of the notorious characters that have lately sprung into an unenviable prominence, I have had the honour conferred upon me.

"As Canadians, we have, most assuredly, received a rude shock by these stirring events which are transpiring in our own Dominion. Our vanity is wounded, our record tarnished, and we, Britons, who on Yankee platforms and in the press used to wax eloquent, in our own eyes, as we with much assurance contrasted, always to our own advantage, the methods of treatment pursued in reference to the Indians by the two nations, seem to have reached a period in our national history when we can sit down and ruminate on the proverb that they who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

"But is it not humiliating that these things should be? that with a past record so honour-

able and satisfactory, we should have this rude awakening, and be obliged to open our eyes to the startling fact that we are really engaged in a war of no mean dimensions with half breeds and Indians ; and that it should occur now, when nearly everybody was of the opinion that satisfactory treaties had been made with the Indian tribes, and that the claims of the half breeds had been met by a liberal issue of scrip, makes it the more extraordinary.

"If it had occurred years ago, when these now feeble tribes were mighty and could muster their thousands of proud free warriors, who revelled with delight in the very thought of war and carnage, we might have partially understood it; but in those days all who visited any of those tribes, no matter whether north or south of the boundary line, if they came with the proud distinction of being British subjects, were always received as trusted brothers, and were ever assured of a very cordial welcome.

"Now our hearts are saddened by the sickening details of precious lives lost, fair homes destroyed, and a spirit of unrest and disquiettude aroused that will not subside for years.

"Many are anxiously asking, was there sufficient cause for this unhappy state of things; if so, what was it, and what is the remedy ?

"First, then, as to there having been sufficient excuse for this uprising and defiance of law, we most emphatically say, no.

"There have been no grievances mentioned, even by the most bitter and rebellions of the Metis, to justify them in the lengths they have gone, and for the valuable lives they have taken, and for the injury they have inflicted on the country.

"For a long time, however, there have been influences at work which have made this uprising, which is really a conflict of races, a possibility. Many of these French half-breeds inherited both the traditions and feelings of the past. They well knew that there was a time when their French ancestors were the rulers from Quebec to the Mississippi. Some of their forefathers, with the humiliations following the English victory on the Plains of Abraham, and the subsequent surrender of Quebec, and then of the whole of Canada, had hurried away into the vast wilderness, and there amidst the excitement of almost savage life had kept alive in the hearts and memories of their children and grandchildren, as the years rolled by, the story of their fears and hatred of that race, which had made the Fleur-de-Lis of France go down before the Red Cross of England. Living under the semi-patriarchial rule of the Hudson Bay Company, whose requirements were few, and making their living more by hunting and trapping than by farming, they kept themselves aloof, except for purposes of trade, from the Scotch half-breeds and others speaking the English language, and were much more French than English in their prejudices and feelings.

"With jealous eyes, and bitter feelings, they watched the incoming waves of Anglo-Saxon civilization. They chafed and fretted, and then with Riel—the dreamer, the egotist, the coward—they made that desperate attempt in 1869 and 1870 to retain their supremacy, which has become a matter of history. Into those events we cannot here enter, but vividly burned into memory's tablet are some of the scenes and incidents of those days, when the dear 'Old Flag' was for a time in the dust, and when the snow in front of the old Fort Garry was crimsoned with the life-blood of Scott, a moral, honest, temperate young man, a communicant of the Presbyterian Church, who was foully murdered for his outspoken loyalty, and for his contempt of the man who had dared to dishonor the flag he loved so well.

"With the half-breeds of Manitoba, the Government dealt most honorably and liberally. Hundreds of thousands of acres of good land, most advantageously situated, were allowed them; and in addition, scrip, which was a kind of a deed for much more, was granted them. They threw the scrip upon the market, which was almost glutted with it for a time. Soon after the opening of the country, when emigrants began pouring in, the restless spirit of the Metis manifested itself, and many of them, getting rid of both their scrip and farms, left their province and wended their way to the distant Saskatchewan and other places, where many of their class had gone before. Now, instigated by Riel, and soured by their straightened circumstances, the direct result of their own improvidence, they are found in open rebellion; and with arms in their hands, on ground stained with innocent loyal blood, are demanding their rights. The demand is preposterous in the extreme. It is still an open question requiring candid consideration, whether or not those who can prove that they have not been sharers in the Manitoba allottment, but have been and are settlers in those western settlements, have any just claims or rights beyond what they now enjoy. Common justice says: 'Give them the patents or deeds to the farms on which, as *bona fide* settlers, they reside—but we fail to see that they have claims beyond this which may not be as justly demanded by all loyal emigrants going in as settlers, be they English, Irish or Scotch.

"But the great cause of the present trouble is the scarcity of meat since the destruction of the great buffalo herds. Both Indians and half-breeds well know that the extinction of these animals is due to the coming of the white man, with his superior fire-arms, and his wanton slaughter for the mere excitement of the chase, and also his greed for the profits on the sale of the robes.

"The buffalo was ever regarded by the Indians as the special gift of the Kiche Maneto, the Great Spirit. His nutritious flesh furnished the best of food; his hides gave them their tents, bedding, clothing and moccasins; the sinews were easily made into

the strongest of thread. With plenty of buffalo, they hardly needed anything else. Travellers who visited those broad prairies years ago have given as glowing descriptions of the vast herds that then roamed over those fertile regions; literally, the cattle upon a thousand hills. Strict laws, very similar to our present game laws, were rigidly enforced by the Indians to prevent the unnecessary slaughter of these useful animals. Spears and bows and arrows were the only weapons with which they hunted them. But this is all changed. The pale face has come, and in his mad frenzy to kill he has ignored all the wise laws for their preservation, and so the wholesale slaughter has gone on until now the buffalo is, or very soon will be, classed among the extinct animals. A few years ago as many as 160,000 were slaughtered for the robes alone. When killed in the fall of the year for meat, their robes are about worthless, but during the winter when they are in prime condition as the robes of commerce, the flesh is poor and hard. The result is there was a double slaughter, to obtain meat and to obtain robes.

"Is it any wonder that under such wholesale slaughter, those plains that once teemed with plenty, should now be so devoid of life; and that the half-breeds or Indians should, from their present half-starved condition, wish they could see those days return again? I remember once, when conversing with the late honored Rev. George McDougall on the expensiveness of getting in supplies to my northern mission, hearing him say that the matter of obtaining provisions for his own, and son's families, the previous fall, was a very simple affair. He said that he and one of his sons, with their pockets full of bullets, with their powder horns on their necks, and with their guns in their hands, had mounted their well-trained buffalo runners, and during the afternoon's sport had killed fourteen fa buffalo cows, which furnished them with abundance of fresh meat all through the winter.

"The great yearly event in the life of the half-breeds was the great fall hunt of the the buffalo. When their little crops were secured, like a great mllitary procession they wended their way westward towards the vast feeding grounds of these animals. Wives and children followed after in the quaint, capacious, ungreased, and consequently noisy, vehicles, known as the Red River carts. Hundreds of buffalo used to be killed, and thousands of pounds of dried meat and pemican, and tallow and hides would be secured. This, with the produce of their little farms, although they made miserable farmers, gave them abundance of food.

"So vast was the quantity of meat secured, that great portions of it were sold for a trifle. The Indian tribes, who lived in the outside forest regions, where the buffalo roamed not, when their fisheries or deer huntings were poor, could get all the buffalo meat they wanted at cheap rates in exchange for their furs. Now, all this is changed. With hungry looks, and gaunt forms, we have heard them talk of those bygone times, and mourn over the present state of things. From our standpoint, of course, we could see that these things were inevitable, that as the Anglo Saxon wave of civilization rolled westward those fertile prairies were too valuable to be kept as mere buffalo preserves. But many of these half-breeds and Indians do not thus see it, and hence their bitterness and discontent. Hungry men are naturally apt to be unreasonable and quarrelsome. True, we have made arrangements and treaties with them, but the most advantageons treaties do not give them a tithe of what they once had. What is five doilars a head, with a little twine and ammunition and a few rations, per annum on their now desolate prairies, compared with what they had in those days when the thunder of the tread of the vast herds of buffalo constantly sounded in their ears.

"There is no use disguising the fact, tha these people are in a wretched, half-starved condition. The transition has been too sudden, the old life was too deeply ingrained to be forgotten in a year, or even a decade. Placed on their reserves or settlements, they have never felt contended, and it will take long years and much patience and firmness in dealin with them.

"If there is one thing more important than another, it must be the selection of the men who represent our Government among them. What ever else is done, let us not introduce the American system of giving some political hack an Indian agency, in order that he may be recouped for some service rendered to his party. Already there are facts that have come to light that are humiliating. What seems very much like Texas steers have been furnished where well-broken plough oxen were promised. Miserable ploughs and basswood whipple-trees were sent in to one large reserve. What would be rejected by some people as chicken-feed was sent to one place for seed wheat. True, these and other things were done by sub-agents; but the fact that they could be done at all shows that our methods need overhauling."

HON. MR. READ—Those oxen that were sent in were refused, and others were sent in to take their place.

HON. MR. SCOTT—How does the hon. gentleman know?

HON. MR. READ—I know from information received at the Department.

HON. MR. FLINT—My object is not to say whether they were or were not, but merely to give the reverend gentleman's letter as it is, and to let the House see it for themselves, and decide whether the

reverend gentleman is as much to blame as the *Globe* newspaper would represent him to be in making a statement which does not appear in this letter, and, I think, in this at all events, his views are more likely to be correctly represented. The letter continues :—

"My article is already too long, or I would endeavor to show how I think our whole system of reserves is, a failure, and a great mistake. My theory is the formation of a large Indian province north and east of Lake Winnipeg, in which all our Indians could be more advantageously placed, both for their own happiness and welfare, and for the future progress and safety of the great prairie regions, which we hope to see yet filled with millions of people, who will till the soil and live happy and contented on its resources, and now is the time to promptly attend to it. The uprising of the Indians has destroyed the confidence of the whites. They can never again live in peace and contentment with the Indian. Reserves, as they now are, acattered all through the white settlements. 'Heroic treatment' must be the order of the day, if we expect settlers to come in after what has occurred. The strong arm of the law must punish the half-breeds; the Indians must be removed."

Now, I do not think it would be right for the Government to force the Indians to go into a certain part of the country to settle by themselves, but if they could be persuaded to do so, no doubt it would be the best thing that could happen. I believe, with the rev. gentleman who is the author of this article, that there will never be peace in that country until the Indians are sufficiently civilized to live by agriculture. I would not have detained the House so long if my hon. friend from Quinte had not come to me to obtain the address of the rev. gentleman with a view to writing to him, and he showed me the report in the *Globe*. I had no faith in the accuracy of the report then, and I have no faith in it now. I believe this article which I have read, contains just what the rev. gentleman would have written to the Government, and he should not be blamed for the report in the *Globe*, although he has not contradicted it. I feel that I have been doing a simple duty not only to the rev. gentleman, but to the country, in submitting this article to the Senate.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I am thankful to the hon. member from Quinté for the way in which he has explained this question to the House. I thought when he took his seat that there would be no other speeches on the subject. I felt that I could add very little to what he had said, except to endorse the greater part of it. I suppose it never entered the head of any one in this House that the Government, after making treaties with the Indians, had failed to carry out their part of the agreement. The hon. member from Quinté said nothing more, but merely tried to show from the blue books and public accounts that the Government had done their duty, but the hon. member for Alma has been, on this occasion, a little too zealous. I regret that this discussion has taken place, because we are no more capable of arriving at a correct conclusion upon it than a blind man would be to judge of colors. We are ignorant of the facts. Some hon. gentlemen denounce the rebels, although no one in this Parliament can say why they are in arms. They put other gentlemen in this House in this position, that knowing something more on the subject, they are forced to deny the assertions which are made, and then the trouble begins. I think it would be much better to let those questions rest for the present, until Parliament is in possession of the whole of the facts. Surely, we have a right to expect that a majority in Parliament will prefer the public good to personal prejudice, and if it be found that the Government have done wrong, I am sure a majority of the House will be ready to condemn them. If it should be proved by public documents that the rebels are not as wantonly mischievous as some represent them to be, I hope that there are men who are conscientious enough to admit that these unfortunate people are not such wretches as some believe them to be. I rely upon the honor of our public men to wait until they see what is at the bottom of these troubles before condemning anyone. If the hon. member from Alma were not my representative, I would not say a word on this subject; but in this instance he does not represent my view of the matter, because I am far from believing that those who are now in arms in the North-West, are influenced merely by a desire to be the sole proprietors of that country. They may be wrong in their views, but there are other reasons behind their movement than those which

have been stated here. If they were animated by any such sentiment as the hon. member has stated, why did they remain peaceable and law-abiding for ten or twelve years?

HON. MR. OGILVIE—The tribes were fighting each other.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—No country could be more peaceable than the North-West was until this spring. It is easier for the Government to send an army into that country now, when the Pacific Railway is nearly completed, than it would have been three or four years ago, and if the Metis had been prompted by a desire to keep that country for themselves it would have been much easier for them to fight Canada then, than it is to-day. It shows how little foundation there is for any such assertion. I ask why prejudice public opinion on this subject? This is something more than a question of pounds, shillings and pence; it is a question of life—a question of even more than that; it is one of the public good of this Dominion. There are men in this country who are not ready to believe all those charges that are made against the half-breeds. It is well known that in 1837 and 1838, when the officials of the Imperial Government went to the other side of the Atlantic, none of them confessed they were wrong. After having injured our country in many ways, they returned to England and raised the cry that we were wrong; that we were a people who could not be managed, and that they were right. But it was satisfactory to us to hear some years later, as I heard from a governor who was sent out here, that if England had known at the time how those Imperial officials had treated Lower Canada, there would have been no rebellion, because we would not have had any cause to complain. It is because I remember all these events that I now say, "let us wait; let us not prejudice public opinion." But if any one wishes to precipitate a discussion on the matter, I am ready to fight it out in my own way. But for the sake of our country, for the sake of peace and harmony, let the matter rest while our men are fighting and spilling the best blood of Canada in the west; let us admire, but let us also keep quiet; let us help them if we can to terminate the insurrection, but let us do nothing more.

HON. MR. POWER—The other day when I made some reference to the disturbance in the North-West my hon. friend from DeLanaudiere rather chid me for introducing a subject here which might lead to a somewhat heated discussion. Now, I have the right to retaliate on the hon. gentleman. As I understand it, the question of the half-breed grievances is not before the House. The hon. gentleman who brought this matter before us did not deal with the half-breed question, but solely with the Indian question. Of course it is a cognate subject, and it is very hard for gentlemen to deal with the Indians without speaking of the half-breeds too. I do not know that I should have said anything about this subject had not the hon. gentleman who introduced it to the notice of the House taken occasion, as some members of the Senate so often do, to introduce party politics, and to read from the *Globe;* and his speech was to a certain extent a reply to the editorial comment in that newspaper on an address delivered by a Wesleyan clergyman. The hon. gentleman undertook to tell us, and the hon member from Belleville (Mr. Flint) also undertook to tell us, that what they read from that reverend clergyman showed that the *Globe* report was wrong. I did not so understand it. If I caught the figures given by the hon. gentleman from Quinté as furnished to him in the letter of the Rev. Mr. Young, that gentleman stated that while some $170,000 was expended in feeding the Indians and giving them necessaries——

HON. MR. READ—No, the amount is $170,000 in bounties.

HON. MR. POWER — $170,000 in bounties, $800,000 odd were expended for other purposes. That is pretty nearly the proportion of 5 to 25, and the statement in the *Globe* is not so far out of the way. Not knowing as much as the hon. gentleman from DeLanaudiere does about the merits of the difficulties between the Indians and the Government or their agents, I cannot undertake to say to say a great deal on the subject; but I shall say this, and I think it is something that must

strike everyone. Canada has been dealing with Indians for a great many years. Ever since 1763 the government of this country has been obliged to deal with the Indian tribes, and I think this is the first time that we have had any serious difficulty with any of them. It may be that the Indian is not exactly the sort of individual that he is represented by Cooper and other novelists; but as far as one can gather from persons who have been amongst the Indians, and others who have had dealings with them, they are people who, if you keep your word with them and deal fairly with them, are not at all difficult to manage, and are not likely to make trouble. Up to a very recent date the Indians were always fairly dealt with, and I think there must have been recently some alteration in the mode of dealing with them to lead to this change in their conduct. No doubt the failure of the buffalo has been a very serious element in the question, but that is not all—there must be something else. One fact must strike every one who has read anything about this matter, or who has talked with people who have been in the North-West, or have had anything to do with the Indians there, that is that there is throughout the whole of that North-West country—amongst all those Indians—a most astonishing want of respect for and confidence in, the Indian Commissioner. One never hears a good word said of Mr. Dewdney by anyone who speaks of that country. I have talked with people who have been up there and had a good deal to do with the Indians, and I have never heard one of them yet who did not speak in the same tone of the feelings which the Indians entertain towards him. When we find that a whole race of people, who are not unreasonable, entertain the same feeling towards an officer who has to deal with them, there must be some reason for that feeling. When Mr. Morris, a gentleman appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, was Governor of Manitoba and Indian Commissioner, there was never any difficulty in the administration. The Indians had confidence in him, and when he said a thing they believed it. Mr. Laird spent a number of years there and the Indians entertained the same feeling towards him. He never said anything that he did not mean, and when he made a promise it was fulfilled. The Indians knew and felt that, and had the highest respect for him; and I have very little doubt that if the present Indian Commissioner had been a different kind of a man from what he is, this difficulty might have been, to a very considerable extent, avoided. We have heard the opinions of clergymen read, and it happens that I have been furnished with some clerical authority, too. The first is a letter which is published under date of March 31st.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—What paper is that?

HON. MR. POWER—The *Daily Times* of Moncton, an extreme Conservative paper. The letter from which I propose to read an extract is written by a Church of England clergyman. He says:—

"As to the Indians, all persons who know anything about them state that they have been badly treated through the rascality of agents.

"The government rations are scanty enough, but it is openly stated that they do not get even these in full quantity. There is no doubt that Governor Dewdney must be held responsible if there is an Indian outbreak, for he and the agents have not represented matters at Ottawa as they were."

Then later on in the letter this reverend gentleman says:—

"The Indians are hungry and desperate. They have no confidence in Dewdney, and a little more delay in getting control of the outbreak will prove disastrous, and will send them over to Riel by hundreds."

Unfortunately the prediction made by that gentleman on the 31st of March has been verified, so far as to their going over in considerable numbers to Riel. Now I will read an extract from a paper by the Rev. James Seiveright, a Presbyterian clergyman, which was published in the *Canada Presbyterian*. He says:—

"Armed rebellion must be crushed by force. The causes that led to the uprising are far deeper than cannon or rifles can reach. A wise and conciliatory management of the Indian Department would have prevented the whole trouble. Had the Controller of Indian Affairs been of the same stamp of Governors Laird or Morris, the volunteers might have been peacefully pursuing their wonted vocations, and the country spared a large expenditure of life and treasure. The redmen of the North-West have substantial grievances. Deprived of their hunting grounds and the buffalo—their main means of subsistence—by

the advent of the whites, they are often reduced to the verge of starvation by the scarcity of game. Over the graves of Indians buried while I was in Prince Albert, might truly be inscribed: 'Died of starvation or diseases caused by want of food.'"

This from a clergyman who has recently come down from the Prince Albert country. He adds:—

"The muskrat is the main reliance in winter. When it is scarce, famine stare the redmen in the face. Indians are shiftless, disinclined to hard. steady work; still, men inured to the chase, and nothing else, have a right to be fed by those who took from them lands, their means of subsistence; a right to at least as much food as would keep soul and body together."

Further on he says:—

"The Indian problem can never be rightly solved by mere speculators like Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney and some of the officials of the Indian Department. No one can conjecture to what extent rebellion may spread among famine-stricken men.

This shows that people who were up there do not quite agree with my hon. friend from Quinté in thinking that the Indians have no substantial reason for being troublesome. The Government are not directly responsible, because they have been spending money and doing their best in that way to keep those Indians quiet; but I think the Government have suffered to a certain extent, for the shortcomings of their agents. It is to be regretted that these agents were not called to account earlier. The hon. gentleman, who brought up this matter, referred to the supplies, and to the way in which they are furnished. He says that tenders are called for, and the supplies are furnished by contract. I am not finding any fault with the way in which the Government have been procuring the supplies; I presume they are procured in the same way that they have been obtained all along, but I wish to point out, as a matter of information, that there are very serious drawbacks to that mode of furnishing supplies. For instance, the Government call for tenders for the supply of a certain quantity of hay to all the different posts; and the same way with regard to fuel and other necessary articles. Naturally enough, none but those who have the means of conveying goods over all that country, can tender with any chance of success. The consequence is, that the Hudson Bay Company, having stations all over the North-West, and having the means of carriage in their possession, are in a better position, as regards a very large portion of the country, than anybody else to furnish those supplies. Now, hon. gentlemen will see how this operates. I quote from a letter written by a settler up there, a William Millar, who went from New Brunswick up to Prince Albert, and writes from there under date of March 20th.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—What paper is that?

HON. MR. POWER—It does not make any difference what paper it is. It is the Moncton *Transcript*. This letter was written before the outbreak of the troubles. He says:—

"We have to depend on a local market. The Indian and police supplies have all been given to the Hudson Bay Company."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The statement is not correct, because the supplies are not all procured from the Hudson Bay Company.

HON. MR. POWER—I did not say they were all; I said as regards some things they had a great advantage.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I refer to the statement of the writer; he says they are all procured from the Hudson Bay Company. That is not correct.

HON MR. POWER—That is at Prince Albert. Of course one takes these statements for what they are worth; no doubt, as they are made by a person laboring under natural excitement, they are somewhat exaggerated.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. member for Niagara says, "hear, hear." That hon. gentleman, when there is no reason to be excited, often speaks in an exaggerated way here.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I do not think the hon. gentleman has a right to make any such statement. I call upon him to

explain what he means when he says that I speak in an exaggerated way.

HON. MR. POWER—I mean what I say.

HON. MR. PLUMB—You have no right to say that, and it is not correct.

HON. MR. POWER—We had an illustration of it the other day when the hon. member ventured to correct my hon. friend from Albert, and was inaccurate.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is out of order.

HON. MR. POWER—In what way?

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman has no right to refer to a previous debate.

HON. MR. POWER—That is a very small point. I shall now read this letter:

"We have to depend on a local market. The Indian and police supplies have all been given to the Hudson Bay Company. That means, nearly all the money goes out of the country."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Now, that statement is not correct.

HON. MR. POWER—The letter continues:—

"It is put into their power to pay us in trade, and they have taken the advantage of it to the utmost. I will give an instance or two:—They let 500 cords of wood, by private contract, to Hudson Bay Company at $3.50 per cord. I would have liked to have had the job at $2.00 per cord, and would have done well by it. It did not cost them $2.00 per cord Also, a contract for hay at $25 per ton, the Hudson Bay Company paying $7 for it, and paying both in trade."

I call the attention of the Minister to the last sentence particularly. It is perfectly clear that settlers at Prince Albert, who were obliged to supply hay to the Hudson Bay Company at $7 per ton would feel it a sort of grievance that the Hudson Bay Company were getting from the Government for that same hay $25 per ton. That little fact will show how the Indian supplies have cost more than they should. As I have said, I am not directly blaming the Government, for the system has been for some time in existence there. I simply mention this as indicating the feeling in that country.

HON. MR. ALMON—What does wood cost?

HON. MR. POWER—$3.50 per cord.

HON. MR. ALMON—I do not consider that a high price. Labor up in that country must be high. A man would get probably $2 a day, and he would not cut more than a cord in a day.

HON. MR. POWER—My hon. friend perhaps knows better than William Millar who is living up there. I do not pretend to know anything about it; I merely read Mr. Millar's statement.

HON. MR. ALMON—I do not consider that $3.50 per cord for wood is too high.

HON. MR. POWER—While it is unfortunate that the Indians appear to be in a somewhat ill-tempered and dissatisfied frame of mind just now, I do not think they have had any very serious grievances to complain of, nothing to justify them in taking up arms as they have done. But the Indian has nothing to do; he has not the same occupation in the way of hunting that he formerly had when the country was in a state of nature, and before it passed into the possession of the Dominion. The different tribes also amused themselves in those days by fighting with one another. That they do not do now, and when there is a fight going on I suppose they have the feeling that is attributed to the typical Irishman, that they want to have a hand in it. There is one reflection that occurs to me with respect to that fight; it might be, perhaps, a wise policy for the Government to secure the services of a certain number of Indians—say the Blackfeet—as scouts.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Nothing could be more disastrous than to employ them in any way.

HON. MR. POWER—That is a matter on which opinions may differ. I offer a suggestion; and I know that a great many men who have been up

there and are well acquainted with the Indians are of the same opinion—that a warlike tribe like the Blackfeet are very likely to get into the fight if it continues for a certain time. Now, if a certain number of them were selected—I do not suggest that they should be taken as part of the forces exactly—but if 150 or so of them were utilized as scouts they would be of very great service to the troops and would prevent anything in the nature of a surprise by the other Indians or half-breeds; and the fact that a number of those men were in the service of Canada would keep the remainder of the tribe loyal. It may be that that is a mistaken view altogether, but I think there is a good deal to be said for it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think the hon. member from Quinté has done the country good service in calling attention to the incorrect statements made by the Rev. Mr. Young; evidently those statements are incorrect, as read. Whether the Rev. Mr. Young did make them in the language in which they are quoted, or whether the subsequent paper read by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Flint) more correctly represents his views, at all events the statement that appears in the paper conveys an erroneous impression—that the larger portion of the money which is given to the Indians by Parliament is applied, not for their benefit, but for the purpose of paying agents and others who are the intermediaries between the country and the Indians. That, in the degree which is mentioned there, is an enormously erroneous statement.

HON. MR. SCOTT—What statement?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The statement that out of every $30 voted by Parliament for the Indians, only $5 finds its way to the Indians, and the other $25 is lost among the officers of the Department employed to distribute the fund to the Indians. That was the statement. Upon the reverend gentleman being applied to, he does not seem to have taken the opportunity, as I should have hoped he would have taken it, of saying that the statement as it appeared in the newspapers was erroneous, because a statement of that kind on the face of it is incorrect. No one could read it without seeing that it is wrong. I hope and trust that the reverened gentleman was misreported and that he did not state anything of the kind; but it is very desirable and important that attention should be called to the statement, and that the contradiction which the hon. gentleman has given to it should become public, and that the people should know that although the Rev. Mr. Young has been in the North-West eight or nine years, if he did state this he was grossly incorrect.

I have brought down with me the information which the hon. gentleman has given to the House. I did not know that he had gone into the subject so thoroughly, and I had brought down the information in order to supply the statistics which he has given to the House. I need not read them. The only information I can supplement is a statement which my hon. friend has not procured, of the manner in which beef, bacon and flour are distributed under treaties six and seven, and the quantities of these various articles that these Indians have got. The following is

A STATEMENT showing the number of Indians in Treaties 4, 6, and 7, in the North-West Territories, and the quantities of Flour, Beef and Bacon distributed to them during the year ended the 30th June, 1884:—

	Number of Indians.	Provisions Distributed.			Fish. lbs.	Potatoes lbs.	Daily Rations.
		Flour. l	Beef. lbs.	Bacon. lbs.			
Treaty No. 4	5,700	504,500	7,800	136,771			1 lb. of Flour, and when Beef is given 1 lb. of Beef or ⅓ lb. of Bacon.
" No. 6	8,400	328,700	2,000	82,150	60,000		
" No. 7	6,400	497,900	2,341,903	141,021		38,422	½ lb. of Flour & 1 lb. of Beef.

HON. MR. POWER.

It should be stated that, in addition to the above, the Indians themselves raise considerable quantities of grain, roots and vegetables. In treaty No. 4, rations are distributed to all working and destitute Indians, in the proportion of one pound of flour, one pound of beef, or, in lieu of beef, one-third of a pound of bacon per diem, the distributions occurring once a week. In treaty No. 6, the number of working and destitute Indians rationed is proportionately less than in treaty 4, owing to the fact that game and fish are more plentiful, and that hunting and fishing are very generally followed by the Indians. In treaty No. 7, all Indians remaining on the reserves receive a daily ration, the distributions occurring every other day.

I thought that the House might like to see the ground covered by these treaties. I have brought down copies of the treaties to which the hon. gentleman from Quinte has already alluded, and I need not trouble the House with them, but I have a map here which I will lay on the table of the House showing the different areas covered by the several treaties. The territory covered by each treaty is marked with a different color.

With reference to the general question, I agree with my hon. friend from De-Lanaudiere that the time has not arrived for a discussion of the grounds which induced the Indians or the half-breeds there to take the course which they have adopted. It seems to me that it is the wiser course, and I think my hon. friend from Halifax will ultimately come to that decision, to refrain from discussing the reasons they have, or think they have, until all the facts are before us. The Government are responsible for the manner in which the affairs of that country have been conducted, and if those troubles have been caused by any dereliction of duty on their part, it will be time to fix that responsibility, and punish them for it, when all the facts are before Parliament; but I do not think it fair to drag into this discussion, with the little information we have before us, the name of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Territories.

HON. MR. POWER—It is perfectly right to do so.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—How do we know what course Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney has pursued, or what he has done, or what he has omitted to do? The hon. gentleman speaks only from what he has seen in newspaper correspondence.

HON. MR. POWER—I have read those letters, and I have read other articles besides; and the Minister of Justice forgets that I stated also that I had had conversations with numbers of persons who had been through the North-West, and that I found one universal chorus of complaints against that officer.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—Supposing the hon. gentleman has had that in addition to the newspaper articles and letters, I ask him is it fair to use the name of the Lieutenant-Governor in the way he does, at all events with the paucity of information which he has upon the subject, and upon a motion of this kind, when nobody supposed that the name of Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney was to be brought into this debate? The hon. gentleman from Quinte, in drawing attention to this question of the treaties with the Indians, described what those treaties were, and mentioned what was agreed on our part to be furnished to the Indians on behalf of the public, and how those supplies were distributed; and then said that he had found in the newspapers a statement of a gentleman who had been up there, and said so and so.

HON. MR. POWER—And he then drew a picture of the Indians reading the *Globe*, which was very amusing.

HON. MR. READ—I did not speak of the Indians reading the *Globe*, but I spoke of the effect that would be produced by someone reading such articles as that in the *Globe* to the Indians in their present excited condition.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—And I suppose it is a barely possible thing. Putting the Government to one side, it is injurious to the conntry that such reports should go abroad that we are not doing our

duty, and that we are not keeping our plighted faith with the Indians, that the money voted by Parliament for the Indians has been squandered, and that we are distributing bad food amongst them. Putting the Government on one side altogether, it is injurious to the country to have such reports sent abroad, and therefore, I think the hon. gentleman from Quinte, did good service in bringing before the notice of the House, the information which he has given us. He said nothing about Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney or anybody else doing anything, or having done anything, and made no charges. When the facts are all before us, the Government will be anxious to facilitate all inquiry and will endeavor, if possible, to get at the very bottom of the cause of the present troubles in the North West. As far as the Indians are concerned, I apprehend the cause of their rising is the scarcity of the buffalo. There may be other things that have irritated them; there may have been, occasionally, misconduct on the part of some officers of the Government that they do not approve of; but let us wait until we ascertain the truth and find out who is to blame and then let us hold that person or those persons strictly to account, and no one will be more ready to do so than the Government. But, until then, it is better in the interests of the country to refrain from discussing these matters. I desire to say in reply to my hon. friend that it is not the intention of the Government at present to make any new treaty with the Indians. The territory which is now covered by treaties is a very large territory, and runs as far north as there seems to be any necessity for making arrangements about in the meantime. This policy was arrived at in the early part of 1884, and a letter was then written to the Bishop of St. Albert, communicating to him the fact. He seems to have asked of the Superintendent General whether new treaties were to be concluded or not, and to have asked that question on behalf of the Indians north of the country we have now acquired, and who seemed to be desirous of having a treaty made with them. The letter is dated the 28th of May, and is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
OTTAWA, May 29th, 1884.

Right Rev. Sir,

With reference to your letter of the 28th of July last, relative to the desire of the Indians, whose hunting grounds are situated north of the northern boundary of Treaty No. 6, to enter into treaty relations with the Government, and also referring to the document signed by the Indian Chief on behalf of the Indians of Ile a la Crosse on the same subject, I am directed by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs to inform your Lordship that having caused enquiry to be made into the matter, he is of opinion that the negotiating of a Treaty with these Indians may be postponed for some years, or at least until there is a likelihood of the country being required for settlement purposes.

I have the honor to be,

Right Rev. Sir,

Your Obdt. Servant,

(Sd.) L. VANKOUGHNET,

Deputy of Supt. Gen'l of Indian Affairs.

The Right Rev.
BISHOP OF ST. ALBERT,
St. Albert, N. W. T.

That would show that the Indians who have not had treaties made with them are desirous of coming under them; I think, in the meantime, at all events, we should be willing to assume that the faith of the country has been kept with the Indians; that they have got all that the treaties secured to them, and we know in many cases they have got more, and those stories about bad pork and bad beef should be taken with great allowance and great care, because it is the duty of the Government, and the interest of the Government, to see that the Indians are fairly dealt with and get good rations. Until the contrary is proved, let us believe that the officers employed by the Government have done their duty. It is a source of great mortification to the Government, as it must be to every lover of his country, to find that there has been a change in the feeling of the Indians towards us. It has hitherto been a matter of pride to us, and I have sometimes boasted of it in this House, that the Government of Canada have been able to manage the Indian tribes so well, that they have hitherto been peaceable and law-abiding citizens. That they have been so, is owing mainly, I think, to their faith in the Hudson Bay Company, and the fact that the Hudson Bay Company had always carried out their promises with the Indians; that gave us, as their successors in the government of the country, the high standing we have had amongst the Indians to this time. That

good feeling, and that confidence in the Government, were a heritage that has been left to us. It was a heritage that was deserved, and I think we still deserve it, and if any of the officers of the Government have done anything towards forfeiting that high character for fair dealing, they should be held strictly to account, and if the Government are to blame they should be held strictly to account, and I trust and believe the country will always hold us strictly to account for our treatment of the Indians of the North-West.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—I think it is perfectly clear, from the statement made to the House by the hon. gentleman from Belleville, that the Indians have been treated more than justly. Treaties were made with them, and terms and payments were made, and beyond those terms and payments, they received large quantities of food.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think my hon. friend is not quite in order. I think when the reply to a question of this kind is given by the Government, the debate should close.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Freedom of debate!

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I ask the House whether it is not proper to close a discussion of this kind when the reply has been made? It seems to me that to continue the debate would be to wander into a long discussion, to which there would be no end. We have gone as far as we ought to go under the usage and pactice of Parliament, which enable a question to be put and explained by the mover and by others, who desire to speak on the subject, and then replied to by the gentlemen who represent the Crown on the occasion.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I submit to the House that the leader of the Government ought to have waited—

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I call the hon. gentleman to order.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—I am perfectly willing to forego any remarks that I wish to make, in deference to the wish of the House.

HON. MR. READ—I wish to ask a question regarding the Bishop, whose letter has been quoted by the leader of the House. Where does that Bishop reside?

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—At St. Albert.

THE SPEAKER—I desire to say with the regard to the position of this question, that I do not consider that it is strictly out of order for any member to continue this discussion, although it is very unusal after the Government has given the reply. However, it is in the power of the House to control the whole subject, and if any member desires that the discussion should not proceed further, and makes a motion to that effect, I will close it.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I am very glad that the Chair has ruled in accordance with what I am sure is the desire of the people of this country and the desire of the House.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—I rise to a question of order. I was prevented from speaking on this subject, and there is no question before the House, and I object to anyone continuing the debate.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I will simply observe that I quite agree with the views expressed by hon. gentlemen before me, that we should be able to discuss this matter more intelligently if we waited until fuller information was placed before us; but we have this fact, that an insurrection has taken place; and we have further, the fact that an alarming statement has appeared that the Indians in different parts of the North West may possibly rise and join the half-breeds. With such a fact before Parliament, surely we should not be discharging our duty to the people of this country if we did not, according to the information that we possess, endeavor to find out what could have led to this state of dissatisfaction amongst the Indians. If we take up the reports of the Indian Department, and I have done so, and read them carefully, I cannot find from

those reports that there should be any disturbance amongst the Indians. The reports of the special agents speak of the instructors having done their duty, of the Indians being trained to cultivate the soil, of their being supplied with rations, and that everything was going on peaceably. Then, I ask if that is a reliable report, how does that tally with the events which have transpired since the insurrection of the half-breeds, and how does it tally with the rumors which appear in this morning's journals? It is proper that we should inquire into and endeavor to ascertain what is the cause of those troubles. We know that Parliament grants upwards of $1,000,000 towards feeding and instructing those Indians. I do not desire to make any charge against Lieut.-Governor Dewdney, for whom I have always entertained great respect. I was surprised this morning, after having perused the report issued by the Indian Department, to meet the owner of an extensive ranche in the North-West in the streets of Ottawa, and touching that subject he said, "One cannot wonder that there should be discontent amongst the Indians. When I visited my ranche, a short time ago, I found them giving damaged pork to the Indians—pork that was not fit for a dog to eat, which led to much murmuring." When I meet a loyal citizen who states that fact of his own knowledge, I am led to inquire is this report that we have from the Indian Department reliable? I do not blame the Lieut.-Governor of the North-West, but I say there is something wrong—that while Parliament votes $1,000,000 the different tribes of Indians should still be dissatisfied. The fact of their being in a state of insurrection to-day convinces me that there is something wrong in the distribution of that money. I have lived much amongst the Indians, and my experience has been that if you only keep faith with them, and show that you take an interest in their welfare, you would never have an insurrection amongst them. But if the Government continue to appoint, as a previous speaker has said, mere political hacks as agents amongst those Indians, it is one of the fertile causes of the trouble, men who have been sent out there merely to provide them with office. They may not be men of principle, and how do we know that those officers have distributed the food faithfully amongst the Indians? The Lieutenant-Governor may not know whether those men have not appropriated the food that was intended for the Indians, to other purposes. The Government may try to check all the debate on this subject, but the future of the country depends on the appointment of proper, upright officers to administer the affairs of the North-West, and not political hacks, who are not worthy of the position. The policy in dealing with the Indians ought to be one of paternal care and kindness, and if such were acted upon, we should not be troubled with an insurrection in the North-West.

RICHELIEU & ONTARIO NAVIGATION CO'S BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. MR. PELLETIER moved the second reading of Bill (6), "An Act further to amend the Acts incorporating the Richelieu Navigation Company, and the Richelieu & Ontario Navigation Company." He said: This Bill has passed through the House of Commons, as presented there, without any opposition, and I do not expect that any opposition will be made to it here. The only parties interested in the Bill are the shareholders themselves, and I do not think anyone can have any objection to it. A certain number of shares were purchased on the open market for the company, and the purchase was made in part out of funds borrowed for that purpose. Since then some doubt has arisen as to the validity of the purchase; the Bill legalizes that purchase, and provides for the purchase of the balance of the shares which remain on the open market, at a price not exceeding 60 per cent. upon its par value, and for the issue of debentures to the amount of $200,000 for a period not exceeding ten years, bearing interest at six per cent. Great precautions are taken to secure the interests of the shareholders by saying that such purchase of the balance of shares shall only be made after one month's notice shall have been given to each shareholder of the intention to purchase. Such debentures are to be a first mortgage and pri-

vilege on all the company's property, but they are not to be issued until all existing claims on such property shall have been previously paid and extinguished. The last clause provides that the quorum of the board of directors shall hereafter be a majority of the number of directors constituting the board.

HON. MR. READ—Is there any precedent for a company issuing debentures to buy back its own stock?

HON. MR. PELLETIER—I am not prepared to give any precedent now, but I have no doubt I can do so when the Bill goes before the committee.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON BILL.

AMENDMENTS CONCURRED IN.

HON. MR. GOWAN moved concurrence in the amendments made in committee of the whole House on Bill (S), "An Act to amend the Act respecting Offences against the Person." He said: The amendments made to this enactment are in this position, that the wife is competent to give evidence, but it must be fortified by corroborative testimony. I need not dwell upon the subject as the matter has been fully discussed.

HON. MR. POWER—I understood that my hon. friend wanted some slight amendment made. Several gentlemen have spoken to me since this matter was before the House yesterday, and there seems to be a very decided impression that there is no reason why a husband should not be allowed to give evidence on his own behalf on occasions of this kind; and I move that the amendments be not now concurred in, but that the Bill be referred back to a committee of the whole for the purpose of amending the same by striking out all the words after "child" in the 10th line to the end of the said clause and inserting the following in lieu thereof:—

"The accused and his wife shall be competent to give evidence as witness either for or against the accused."

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think we had this matter thoroughly before us yesterday, and discussed in committee, and that there was a general consensus of opinion in favor of the amendment then made, that a woman's evidence was not sufficient to convict her husband. That, it seemed to me, met with general approval, and I hope that the House will not depart now from what was the evident feeling of the committee.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I think that when the matter was discussed in committee of the whole, my hon. friend opposite, from whom I am very sorry to differ, proposed his resolution, and it was passed upon by the House. I cannot accept this amendment except the House pronounces upon it. I think it is just the entering of the wedge to a most objectionable principle of allowing the prisoner to give evidence on his own behalf. While there are some exceptions perhaps to be made in a case like this, still it is a dangerous point to begin with, and I should be sorry if the House assented to the proposition.

HON. MR. O'DONOHOE—I do not agree with the very strong desire on the part of my hon. friend that the husband should, in a case of this nature, be unable to give evidence. This is different from ordinary cases. I do not think it should be allowed that the wife can bring her husband into court, and say just what she pleases under oath, while the husband, the party charged, as between himself and his wife, is to have his mouth closed. I do not think it is entering the thin edge of the wedge as against any established law. I have not had the long experience of my hon. friend from Barrie, but I have had a good deal of experience in criminal courts, and from that experience I conclude that it would be a most dangerous thing to enable a wife, who may in a moment of passion, or excitement, or in a state of jealousy, be prepared to do anything against her husband. There is nothing to which, under any of those conditions, she might not pledge her word, and against her husband, for whom, when she cools off, she would gladly lay down her very life. We should give her no chance to create such a state of feeling between herself and her husband, as might render the differences

between them for ever after irreconcilable. The husband who has been bound to her for years and years, and who has a family, may be charged by her, in one of those moments of passion, with not being willing to support herself and her children, and he, who alone can tell of his means to do that, or give evidence of it, is not allowed to state his case. Which of the two is more likely to tell the truth, or to give the best evidence under such circumstances—the woman who lodges the information against the husband, or the husband against whom the complaint is lodged? From my experience, I would attach much more consequence to the evidence of the husband than I would to that of the wife. I am very reluctant in saying a word against the Bill, or against the view of my hon. friend, for whom, and for whose experience, I have great respect, but I cannot allow any respect for the person, or for his experience, to stand in the way of discharging what I feel to be the duty of the House. I believe it is proper that in such a case as this, the husband should be allowed to explain the reasons why he is brought there, and in giving him that liberty I believe that you add very much to the chances of diminishing the number of such cases. I shall, therefore, vote for the amendment of my hon. friend from Halifax.

HON. MR. DICKEY—My hon. friend who has charge of this Bill objected to this proposal on a previous occasion, to allow the husband to be placed on the same footing as his wife, by saying that it would be an entering wedge in the criminal law. But who started the entering wedge? It was my hon. friend himself. When he brought in this Bill he introduced the thin end of the wedge by asking that the wife should be allowed to give evidence against the husband, when my hon. friend knew that that is contrary to all principles of criminal law. When this Bill was first before the House he gave as his reason that it was only following out the legislation which we had two or three years ago made in the case of complaints for assault and battery. Then, when I called his attention to the fact that we only ask to proceed on exactly the same lines as that, he shifts his ground and says it is entering the thin end of the wedge into the criminal law, and that it will be applied to other cases. I wish to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that in this very session we have refused to legislate any further in that direction, and I think he might trust the House, with the benefit of his assistance, to keep itself right in that respect. If we were to act upon the objection which he takes, we would not consider this Bill at all, because it is the thin end of the wedge that he introduced himself, and we have foregone our opposition to that.

We say here we are perfectly willing to let the Bill go if you make it conformable to the only Act on our statute book which is a precedent for it—that is the Act passed three years ago by which both husband and wife are allowed to give evidence for each other in cases of assault and battery. The feeling of the House at that time was that we could go no further; the feeling of the House has been evidenced since by what has taken place this session, but my hon. friend persists in pressing this Bill forward and insists on objecting to the husband in the cases covered by this Bill being put on the same footing as the wife. Why should he not? There has not been a single reason given to the House why the husband and wife should not be on the same footing. The hon. member who has just sat down has put that strongly. I put it on the simple ground that if it is right for the wife to give evidence in such a family quarrel as this—and I doubt whether it is good policy, but I am willing to forego my opinion on that—if it is right to give her that privilege, surely it is right to give her partner, the other party to the squabble, the same right. It is difficult, looking at the question logically, to get over that. The hon. member from Lunenburg yesterday moved a very good amendment, as far as it went, to prevent the wife coming in and telling her own story, and getting a verdict against her husband without corroborative testimony, but my hon. friend knows very well, from his experience as a criminal lawyer, that where a woman would undertake to convict her husband, if she were unscrupulous, she would very easily get someone to come forward and confirm her statement. The amendment is, therefore, no great protection after all. But I do not see

why that amendment, good as it is, should interfere with the one which I propose, because that only provides for a case where the wife comes to give evidence against her husband, and it is no answer at all to what we contend for, that the husband should be put on the same footing as the wife, and be allowed to give evidence in his own defence. As far as my experience goes, I have never seen a plainer statement of a ground for proceeding as we are doing in asking this amendment. It is logically correct; it is in conformity with the legislation of three years ago, and I have not heard a single ground upon which the House should be called upon to give this advantage to the wife and withhold it from the husband. The object of testimony it to elicit the truth. When a woman comes forward to give evidence against her husband she is subject to feelings which require her evidence to be confirmed; when the husband comes forward to tell his tale he is likely to be swayed by the same feelings, and his evidence will be taken for what it is worth, and no more; but to shut the door against him and say we will allow the wife to tell her story and bring forward witnesses to support her statement, perhaps a mere child, is to my mind most unfair. The very statement of the case shows the impropriety of it. I hope the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill will accept the amendment which I have proposed.

The House divided on the amendment which was adopted by the following vote:

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Alexander,	McClelan,
Almon,	Macdonald,
Archibald,	McKay,
Baillargeon,	McMillan,
Botsford,	O'Donohoe,
Carvell,	Ogilvie,
Dever,	Pâquet,
Dickey,	Power,
Ferrier,	Smith,
Girard,	Turner.—21.
Haythorne.	

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Campbell (Sir Alex.),	Miller (Speaker),
Flint,	Nelson,
Gowan,	Odell,
Kaulbach,	Plumb,
MacInnes,	Scott,
McDonald,	Vidal.—12.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the Bill to make the proposed amendment.

In the Committee,

HON. MR. GOWAN—I accept with respect the decision of the House, though I am not convinced, and I therefore beg now to move that the amendment be inserted.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE, from the committee, reported the Bill with the amendment.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I move that the report of the committee be concurred in.

HON. MR. ALMON—I move in amendment that the House do not concur in the amendment, but that it be concurred in this day three months. The Bill has been so changed and patched that it is hard to say what the effect of it will be, and I think it will be better to reject it altogether.

HON. MR. POWER—I think my hon. colleague would more properly make this motion at the third reading,

HON. MR. ALMON—Very well, I withdraw my motion for the present.

The third reading was fixed for to-morrow.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AND LIQUOR LICENSE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE POSTPONED.

The order of the day having been called,—

Committee of the Whole House on (Bill 92), The Canada Temperance Act 1878, and The Liquor License Act 1883, further amendment Act.

HON. MR. VIDAL said: At the request of several members, but very much against

my own wishes, I move that the consideration of this Bill be postponed until Wednesday next, then to stand the first order of the day.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 6 o'clock.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Friday, May 1st, 1885.

The Speaker took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

The House was adjourned during pleasure.

BILLS ASSENTED TO.

At 3.30 p.m. the House was resumed.

The Hon. Sir William Johnson Ritchie, Knight, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, Deputy Governor, being seated in the Chair on the Throne; the Deputy Governor was pleased to command the attendance of the House of Commons, and that House being present, the following Bills were assented to, in Her Majesty's name, by His Honor the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General on his behalf, viz:—

An Act to provide for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons.

An Act to provide for the taking of a Census in the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin.

An Act respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.

An Act to reduce the stock of the Federal Bank of Canada and for other purposes.

An Act for the Relief of Amanda Esther Davis.

An Act respecting the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Company.

An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Qu'Appelle and for other purposes connected therewith.

An Act further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Congregational Missionery Society.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.

An Act for granting certain powers to the International Coal Company (limited).

An Act for the relief of George Louis Emil Hatzfeld.

An Act for the relief of Fairy Emily Jane Terry.

An Act for the relief of Alice Elvira Evans.

An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Sisters of Charity of the North-West Territories.

An Act to incorporate the Pension Fund Society of the Bank of Montreal.

An Act respecting the Annuity and Guarantee Funds Society of the Bank of Montreal.

An Act respecting La Banque du Peuple.

An Act to authorise the Royal Canadian Insurance Company to reduce its Capital Stock, and for other purposes.

An Act to amend the Law respecting Bridges, Booms and other works constructed over or in Navigable Waters under the authority of Provincial Acts.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Department of the Secretary of State.

An Act to continue An Act respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank.

An Act respecting the Canada Co-operative Supply Association (limited).

An Act to amend the Act forty-fifth Victoria, chapter Seventeen, to encourage the construction of Dry Docks.

An Act respecting certain advances to the Provinces.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Pacific Employes' Relief Association.

An Act to incorporate the Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada.

An Act respecting Explosive Substances.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.

An Act further relating to the Central Bank of New Brunswick.

An Act respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.

An Act respecting the Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Company.

An Act to incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company.

WEST ONTARIO PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY'S BILL.

REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE.

HON. MR. DICKEY, from the committee on Railways, Telegraphs and Harbors, reported Bill (94), "An Act to incorporate the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company," with amendments. He said: I may explain that the first material amendment is to be found in the 5th clause, from which these words are struck out—"and shall hold office from the 1st February." That refers to the appointment of directors. In the next clause, the appointment is to be made on the first Tuesday in February, and there would necessarily be a hiatus between the two dates unless the first of February happened to be on the first Tuesday in the month. The Bill is amended so that the directors shall remain in office until their successors are appointed. The next amendment is in the 11th clause, where the company ask power to take lands. As these powers are given by the Consolidated Railway Act, and there were other amendments to the Bill, that clause was struck out. The next material amendment is in the clause which enables the company to convey or to lease their lands. There was no provision for any number of shareholders to be represented at such a meeting; and as we thought it was so closely connected with the disposition of the whole property, we considered it necessary to do as we had done in other Bills, to provide that shareholders representing at least one-half in value should be present, or represented by proxy, at the meeting. The next relates to the building of lines of telegraphs and telephones, pursuant to chapter 67 of the Consolidated Statutes of the late province of Canada; but it had no reference to any other Act, and we, therefore, inserted the words "and the Acts amending the same," which was a necessary amendment. The 21st clause asked for powers to build, acquire and work elevators, and the member of the House of Commons who explained the Bill, asked for increased powers to hold docks and wharves, because this railway terminating on one side at Lake Erie, and on the other at River St. Clair, rendered it absolutely necessary that they should have those powers, and we inserted that amendment in the Bill. He also asked for powers to construct and operate a steam ferry on the River St. Clair, in connection with the lines on the other side, so that they could exchange their traffic backwards and forwards, which was also a reasonable amendment. We, therefore, gave the company additional powers to construct and operate a steam ferry across the River St. Clair. The last clause fixed the time for the commencement and completion of the work, but it made no provision that the charter should be null and void unless that work was done. We, therefore, added, by consent of the promoter of the Bill, at the end of the clause which did so provide the time, the following—"otherwise the powers granted by this Act shall be forfeited." These are the only important amendments to the Bill.

HON. MR. PLUMB—As there have been some amendments to the Bill, with a view to bring it into conformity with other railway legislation of this House, perhaps it would be as well to move that the amendments be considered on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

WINNIPEG AND PRINCE ALBERT RAILWAY BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. MR. DICKEY, from the Select Committee on Railways, Telegraphs and Harbors, reported Bill (91), "An Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company," with certain amendments. He said: The first amendment is in the section which gives power to construct the road, but, as it came up from the House of Commons, it gave no power to operate the road. In amending the clause, we give the company power to construct and operate the road. The next amendment is in the 4th section, which asks for power to increase the stock of the company as provided by the Consolidated Railway Act. That clause was struck out, for the obvious reason that the company had the power under that Act. The 7th clause is struck out for the same reason. It asks for

power to take grants of agricultural lands in the North West. As they had already, by the Consolidated Railway Act, power to take lands, this particular provision was rather narrowing their power, because it confined their right to take lands, to agricultural lands wholly. Therefore, we struck out the clause by the consent of the promoters, leaving the company power to operate under the general clause of the Consolidated Railway Act. There is an amendment in the 9th clause, which is of some importance, because it relates to the first meeting for the election of directors, and to subsequent meetings. The amendment provides that, besides the notice in the *Gazette*, as this covers a large district of country, the notice shall be mailed to the different shareholders, as far as their address can be known. The 13th is the bond clause, in which we have provided, as we have in similar other bills, that at the meeting for authorizing those bonds, shareholders representing at least one-half in value of the stock shall be represented in person or by proxy. The note clause has been amended to bring it into harmony with similar clauses in other bills of this kind.

HON. MR. GIRARD—As the amendments to the Bill have been communicated to, and concurred in by, some of the promoters of the Bill, I move that the report be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. GIRARD moved the third reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the third time and passed.

RUSH LAKE & SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY & NAVIGATION COMPANY'S BILL.

REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE.

HON. MR. DICKEY, from the Committee on Railways, Telegraphs and Harbors, reported Bill (79), "An Act to incorporate the Rush Lake & Saskatchewan Railway & Navigation Company. He said: The amendments, although numerous, are not very important, except in two or three instances, which I will explain to the House. I may state generally, that the Bill, as it came to us, appears to have been copied from an old Act which was passed four or five years ago, before steps were taken to bring the language of our Acts into something like harmony, and to strike out all unnecessary verbiage, as far as we could. In consequence of that, several of those amendments are simply verbal, or transposing the sentences, so as to bring them into conformity with our other legislation. These amendments were made with the entire concurrence of the member of the other House who had charge of the Bill there. He expressed his complete satisfaction with the manner in which the Bill had been amended. The first amendment is in clause 6, in which, strange to say, power was asked to build a double line of railway, but now power is taken to build a single line of railway. It was amended to give power to build either a single or a double line. In the 11th, the promissory note clause, an amendment is made to bring it into conformity with other bills of this kind. The 12th, is the bond clause, which requires that at least one-half of the stock shall be represented at the meeting called to authorize the issuing of bonds. In the 19th clause, an amendment is made for striking out the power which is asked for to make regulations for facilities for running arrangements with other companies, inasmuch as that power is already given by the Consolidated Railway Act. Under the 23rd clause, as the Bill came up to us, the railway was to be commenced in two years and completed in three years. When the wide stretch of country which this railway proposes to cover, was considered, the promoter of the Bill asked us to extend the time for the completion of the railway for two years longer, and we, therefore, made the completion of the railway to extend to five years from the passing of this Act. These are the only amendments, but perhaps the House would prefer that they should be printed, and appear on the face of the journals before they are adopted. I, therefore, move that the report be taken into consideration on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS OF THE DOMINION.

ENQUIRY.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER rose to call attention to the present state of the public affairs of the Dominion, and to ask the Government how they proposed to remedy existing evils. He said: At a moment when such troubles have been brought upon the country by misrule, I only propose to touch very briefly some of the more important evils which the party now in power have brought upon us, but before proceeding I will—

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I rise to a point of order. The point of order which I desire to raise is under the rules of the House which regulate the occasions upon which a Senator has a right to address the House. The rule which I invoke is rule 21, which says:—

"A Senator may speak to any question before the Senate or upon a question, or an amendment to be proposed by himself, or upon a question of order arising out of the debate, but not otherwise without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate."

This is the rule of the House, and this is the rule which has been observed in the House of Commons. Certain exceptions have been engrafted on this rule by the usages of Parliament, and more particularly by the usages of the House of Lords and the Senate. In the House of Commons, in England and in this country, questions are put briefly and answered shortly. In the House of Lords and in this House, a certain latitude has been allowed to members who put questions. That latitude originally confined them to such explanations as were necessary to elucidate the question they were about to put. By degrees that latitude was enlarged, and it has, during late years, been the practice in the House of Lords and here to give notice, as the hon. gentleman has done in this case, that he will on such a day draw attention to such a subject, and will ask the Government such a question: but the notice is intended to give the House generally information as to the precise object which the hon. member has in view who is about to put the question, in order that members may prepare themselves for the discussion, and make up their own minds as to the course they will pursue with reference to that particular subject. That pratice has been followed in this House. An instance of it occurred here yesterday, when the hon. member from Quinte drew attention to treaties with the Indians and asked the Government whether it was intended to enter into any new treaties with the Indians. Another notice was given by the hon. member from Niagara, who drew attention to the practice of the House with respect to Bills coming before us, and asked whether the Government would take any steps towards endeavoring to improve the practice, and that is constantly done: but in all these cases there is a specific notice, and there is a specific question. The rule is laid down very plainly—better in Bourinot than in May or Todd—and I will read it to the House. It is put very clearly, tersely and correctly in Bourinot, "Questions put by members," as follows:—

"It is an established rule of Parliamentary practice, and one that should always be strictly observed, that no member is to address the House, unless it be to speak to a motion already under debate, or to propose one himself for discussion. A practice, however, has long prevailed in Parliament, and is now established in the Senate and House of Commons, of putting questions to Ministers of the Crown, concerning any measure pending in Parliament, or other public matter, and of receiving the answers or explanations of the persons so interrogated. This deviation from the general rule respecting motions has arisen from the necessity that experience has shown of obtaining for the House material information, which may throw light on the business before it, and serve to guide the judgment in its future proceedings. The procedure in the Senate on such occasions is quite different from that of the House of Commons. Much more latitude is allowed in the Upper House, and a debate often takes place on a mere question or inquiry, of which, however, notice must always be given when it is of a special character. Many attempts have been made to prevent debate on such questions, but the Senate, as it may be seen from the precedents set forth in the notes below, have never practically given up the usage of permitting speeches on these occasions—a usage which is essentially the same as in the Lords' House. The observations made on such occasions, however, should be confined to the persons making and answering the inquiry, and if others are allowed to offer remarks these should be rather in the way of explanation, or with the view of eliciting further information on a question of public interest. The more

regular, and now the more common practice, is for a member, in cases requiring some discussion, to give notice that he will call attention on a future day to a public matter, and make an inquiry of the Government on the subject. Then it is perfectly legitimate to discuss the whole question at length, as the terms of the notice show the intention of the person who puts it on the paper. This practice of the House of Lords has been followed in the Canadian Senate since 1877."

Now, that pre-supposes a notice of an intention to call attention of the House to a specific matter and to ask a specific question. The hon. gentleman in this case has not taken that course. He has not taken a course which would give the House any information concerning the matter which he proposes to discuss, and the very object of a notice is that the House may be prepared to consider what he brings before them. The notice in this case is:—

"That he will call attention to the present state of the public affairs of the Dominion, and will ask the Government how they propose to remedy existing evils."

Now, calling the attention of the House to the existing state of public affairs may mean anything and everything. It may mean all the policy of the Government from the time they became a Government to the present day. It means all the affairs of the North-West; all the affairs of the Pacific Railway; the tariff—anything and everything the hon. gentleman chooses to talk about: and then his question is, "How they propose to remedy existing evils?" What an inquiry that is, and how impossible it is for any Government to speak in reply to such a question! The hon. gentleman's view of what are existing evils differs, very likely, most materially from the view I entertain, and probably the view of the majority of the House as to what are existing evils; and therefore to say that he will draw attention to everything—because that is substantially the notice he has given—to draw attention to everything and ask everything does not come within the rules and usage of Parliament, even as that usage has been interpreted of late years. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman has no right to address the House and make the inquiry of which he has given notice. I submit the question of order for the consideration of the House.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Knowing, from extensive reading, the procedure of Parliament both in the House of Lords and the House of Commons in England, I never supposed that the leader of the Government in this House would possibly raise any objection to the motion of which I have given notice. If I had anticipated that he would do so, I could have brought twenty different cases in point both in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and I would only respectfully solicit the Speaker of this House to delay his decision on the point of order until Monday, that I may have an opportunity of presenting to this House numerous precedents, as I am prepared to do. When the affairs of a nation or a country are drifting into an alarming condition it has been the privilege of any member of the House of Lords or the House of Commons to refer to the subject and to touch upon any questions in which the public interests are involved. If I had the least idea that the leader of the House, who seems always disposed to block—

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. member is out of order.

THE SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman is not in order. The only argument he can use is as to the question of order.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Then I merely rise to respectfully solicit the Chair to delay the decision on this question until Monday. I will bring to his attention numerous precedents of motions in the House of Lords similar to this one which I have placed on the paper.

THE SPEAKER—The postponement proposed by the hon. member does not rest with me. If the House desire that the question should remain over until Monday, I am perfectly willing to postpone it.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I should think that the feeling of the House would be that the matter should be decided now, if his Honor is prepared to give his decision.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not agree with the hon. member from Amherst. As

it happens the hon. gentleman from Woodstock stands in a somewhat peculiar position in the Senate.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. POWER—He is the leader of the third party in the House, and I believe constitutes the third party himself, and I think that, being in such a small minority, he is entitled to every consideration from the members of the two regular parties. Now, the hon. gentleman has stated here in his place, that he can produce several precedents to justify the action which he proposes to take; and I think that as a matter of courtesy to an hon. member of the House, he should have an opportunity of doing so. If the House should decide not to give the hon. member that opportunity, which I hope they will not do, I think, even looking at the authorities cited by the Minister of Justice, there is nothing out of order in the notice of the hon. gentleman, and the manner in which he proposes to speak. It is true that the subject is a somewhat extensive one, but there is no limitation laid down in Bourinot or the authorities to which he refers as to the extent of a subject. The Government, I think, should be prepared always to defend their policy at all points.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER— Hear, hear.

HON. MR. POWER—I think that it is the duty of the Government to be prepared.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—They are afraid of a debate.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman's notice has been on the paper now for something like a month, and the Government have had every opportunity, if there were any weak places in their defences, to strengthen them, and I do not think it could be pleaded that they are taken by surprise; that is the only object of making the notice definite, to prevent the Government being taken by surprise. Now, I remember that, when this procedure of calling attention to a matter, and then asking a question, was first introduced into this House by the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of the Interior, the hon. gentleman gave a notice which really did not inform the House as to the extent of the ground that he proposed to cover. I remember that in 1877, the notice given was an inquiry of a limited character, and the hon. gentleman travelled over a great deal of ground that was not covered by the notice. In the next session, 1878, the hon. gentleman gave notice that he would call attention to the financial condition of Canada. Well, the financial condition of Canada is a very wide subject. Now, where is the House going to draw the line?

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—That was a specific motion.

HON. MR. POWER—This is a specific motion. It was customary some years ago to move the House into Committee of the Whole on the general state of the provinces, and practically this notice is intended, I presume, to bring about substantially almost the same result as the motion to go into a Committee of the Whole on the general state of Canada. Considering, as I said before, the extreme numerical smallness of the party which the hon. gentleman leads, and the fact that there is ample time just now at the disposal of this House for a discussion of the general condition of the country, the rule ought to be construed in the broadest and most generous spirit.

THE SPEAKER—I am quite prepared to give my decision on this question now, and if it is the pleasure of the House I shall do so.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I call for the yeas and nays whether the Speaker shall give his decision now, or delay it until Monday. I do not believe that any six or eight members should dictate to this House. (Order.) It is contrary to every rule and precedent of Parliament.

THE SPEAKER—When the motion on the paper first attracted my attention, I thought it was of an unusual character. It has been on the paper now for several weeks, and for my own part, I have no idea at the present moment, although it

has come every day under my eye during that time, what the object of the hon. gentleman is in placing the motion on the paper. The practice of asking information from the Government is a very useful one, and prevails largely in both Houses; but the practice of the Senate is very different from that of the House of Commons. In the House of Commons, no such latitude as members enjoy in the Senate is at all permitted. Here, following the practice in the House of Lords, a very great latitude in debate is allowed on notices of this character. Our practice is altogether controlled by the example and precedents of the House of Lords. The rule of the Senate regulating the right of Senators to address the House, I need not repeat, as it has been read by the Minister of Justice. I will, however, read from May on the practice generally of putting questions in Parliament, before referring to precedents that I intend to quote on this subject. May says that:—

"By the practice of both Houses, questions are frequently put to Ministers of the Crown concerning any measure pending in Parliament, or other public event; and to particular members who have charge of a bill, or who have given notices of motion, or are otherwise concerned in some business before the House, a question may be asked concerning the intentions of the Governmeut, in any matters of legislation or administration, but not as to their abstract opinions upon general questions of policy. When a question affects the character of a member, or reflects upon the conduct of other persons, it is more properly the subject of the motion which can be conveniently debated. Notice is usually given of such questions in the votes, unless they relate to some matter of urgency, or to the course of public business. All questions should be limited as far as possible to matters immediately connected with the business of Parliament, and should be put in such a manner as not to involve opinion, argument, or inference; nor are any facts to be stated, unless they be necessary to make the question intelligible. In the same manner, an answer should be confined to the points contained in the question, with such explanation only as will render the answer intelligible, without discussion; but a certain latitude is sometimes permitted, by courtesy, to Ministers of the Crown. It is irregular to refer to past debates, either in a question or answer, but a departure from this rule has been occasionally permitted, in order to clear up misunderstandings. When a question has been fully answered, a member will not be allowed to repeat it. Where notice has been given of an irregular question, it is either corrected at the table, if possible, in conference with the member himself, or wholly omitted by direction of the Speaker.

"Sometimes, when an answer has been given, further questions are addressed to the Minister on the same subject, but no observations or comments are then permitted to be made. In the Lords, a greater license of debate is permitted, in putting and answering questions, and commenting upon them, without any question being before the House. In 1867, the Lords' committee on public business, while recognizing and approving this practice, resolved that notice of questions should be given in the minutes, except in cases of urgency. And on the 2nd April, 1869, it was resolved, 'that it is desirable when it is intended to make a statement or raise a discussion, on asking a question, that notice of the question should be given in the orders of the day and notices."

It is well understood that by the 112th rule of the Senate, that in cases unprovided for the House is governed by the rules, usages and proceedings of the House of Lords.

Bourinot, on the same point, has this clear and emphatic language with regard to the necessity of a notice in repect to a question to be submitted to the House for discussion:—

"The more regular, and now the more common practice, is for a member in cases requiring some discussion, to give notice that he will call attention on a future day to a public matter, and make an inquiry of the Government on the subject. Then, it is perfectly legitimate to discuss the whole subject at length, as the terms of the notice show the intention of the person who puts it on the paper."

Now, to my mind, the terms of the question of the hon. Senator from Woodstock, do not show what question the hon. member intends to ask the Government. With regard to the practice on this subject, I wish first to refer to the precedents of the House of Lords on which our practice is founded, and I shall cite out of innumerable cases which I could mention, one or two showing the practice of the House of Lords on questions of this kind. The first one is in regard to the subject of Railway Amalgamation in 1872:—

"The Earl of Airlie called attention to the question of Railway Amalgamation, and inquired whether Her Majesty's government intend to appoint a Royal Commission, or to move for a Committee for the purpose of investigating the question of a Railway Amalgamation; or whether they intend to propose further legislation on this subject during the present session?"

THE SPEAKER.

Here the subject of the inquiry is clearly and specifically stated; what the noble lord wished to call the attention of the House to, and the question which he intended to ask is as clearly indicated. I will only cite another out of the many cases which I could mention. It is as follows:—

"Lord Chelmsford called attention to the report of the Marriage Law Commission presented to the House in the year 1868, and asked, whether the Government have any intention of taking steps to carry out the recommendations of the commissioners for the amendment of the law?"

Here, again, the subject to which it was the intention of the member to direct the attention of the House, was clearly and specifically indicated, and the question which it was intended to ask the Government is just as clearly foreshadowed in the notice. These questions should and must form precedents to govern our practice. It has been said, however, by the hon. member from Halifax, that questions very similar to the one now before the House have been put in this Chamber hitherto. I differ from the hon. Senator, at least I have searched in vain for any similar motion being made in this House. The case alluded to by the hon. Senator from Halifax, is the first instance which we have in our books. It was on the occasion of a similar motion made by the hon. Minister of the Interior, who was the introducer of this practice into the Senate. The question was:—

"The hon. Mr. Macpherson called the attention of the House to the public expenditure of the Dominion, especially that portion of it which is largely within the control of the administration, and inquired of the Government how it is proposed to restore the equilibrium between income and expenditure?"

Here the subject was the public expenditure of the Dominion, and specifically the controllable expenditure of the Dominion, and the question asked of the Government was how it was intended to restore the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure. In the next year, a similar question was put by the hon. Minister of the Interior on the same subject, as follows:—

"The Hon. Mr. Macpherson having called the attention of the House to the public expenditure of the Dominion, especially that portion of it which is largely within the control of the administration, with a view to inquire of the Government how it is proposed to restored the equilibrium between income and expenditure?"

Here we have again the subject intended to be brought to the notice of the House clearly indicated. The House was not taken by surprise; the Government could not be taken by surprise in the answer they would have to give to the question. But I may say that these two questions put by the hon. Minister of the Interior exhibit a greater latitude in regard to the subject than any others I think to be found either on our journals, or on the records of the House of Lords. I do not know that it is necessary for me to weary the House with further precedents. I have, however, another precedent from a very excellent authority which I must quote. A question was put by the hon. member from Halifax in 1883, as follows:

"Hon. Mr. Power called the attention of the House to certain objectionable features in the management of the line of steamships which now carry the mails between the United Kingdom and Canada, the desirability of making changes in the terms of the existing contract so as to render the operation of the contract more beneficial to Canada, and the necessity of terminating the present contract; and ask the Government whether they have given or propose to give, notice to the contractors of their intention to terminate the said contract, and if so, what is the nature of the changes which the Government propose to make in the terms of the said contract?"

This question, I think, might be very safely adopted as a model by hon. members desiring to put inquiries of this kind. It is the most specific form of question perhaps on our books, and neither the House nor the Government could at all be taken by surprise either in discussing or in answering it. I think I may be permitted to say that the practice has gone quite far enough in this House with regard to inquiries of this character. We have gone beyond the precedents of the House of Lords from which we have taken this practice. In the House of Lords, no notice of an inquiry of this kind can be adjourned, as is often done in this House, because there being no substantive motion there is nothing to found an amendment upon, and a motion for the adjournment of the debate from day to day must be, in amendment to the main motion. Such motions are never made in the House of

Lords. If, however, motions of the description of that which has just now been taken exception to are permitted, I am afraid that our practice will become very loose, and the use of a notice on the paper may almost as well be dispensed with. My opinion clearly is, that the question of the hon. Senator from Woodstock is out of order.

PARLIAMENTARY RETURNS.

HON. MR. POWER—Before the orders of the day are called, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice if he can inform the House what time the reports of the railway surveys, asked for some considerable time ago, will be brought down. When I asked the Minister a few days ago he said that he thought they had been laid on the table of the other House. But that would not be an answer to our resolution, and I imagine that the reports, if brought down, would have been printed before now and distributed amongst members of this House.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I inquired the day after the hon. gentleman put the question to me, and I found that the report had been in the possession of the Minister of Railways, but had not been laid on the table of the other House by him. He told me, however, that he would either give them to me to bring them down here, or would lay them on the table of the other House himself, and I do not know whether he has since brought them down to the other House or not.

A SUGGESTED ADJOURNMENT.

HON. MR. POWER—Before the orders of the day are called, I should like to suggest to the leader of the Government the advisability of adjourning this House over for some time.

HON. GENTLEMEN—Hear, hear! Oh, oh! No, no!"

HON. MR. POWER—The work of this House has been kept up very satisfactorily up to date; there are no arrears of work before us, and it does not seem likely that any work will come from the other end of the building to us for some weeks; and there is at least as much reason now for adjourning over for three or four weeks as there was in an earlier part of the session. It is unfair to keep members here, when there is nothing for them to do.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman is probably more in the secrets of the Opposition as to the course they are pursuing in the other branch than I am. The hon. gentleman, I think, is mistaken in saying that there will be no business up from the other House for three or four weeks. I am sure that unless the party with which he is connected obstructs the business very much in the other House, in a short time there will be work enough before us to keep us occupied, and I think we should remain, because we do not know how soon the policy of the Opposition may change.

HON. MR. ALMON.—If the leaders in this House, in conjunction with the Ministers in the other House, will issue an injunction that no books are to be taken out of the library, I think it would shorten the session of Parliament very much. The practice of reading long extracts from books, which has been carried on in the other House, and which has lately broken out here in a slight degree to the left of Mr. Speaker, should be disallowed, and we would get through the business of Parliament much sooner, and get home to our families.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON BILL.

REJECTED ON THIRD READING.

HON. MR. GOWAN moved the third reading of Bill (S), "An Act to amend 'An Act respecting Offences against the Person,'" as amended. He said: This Bill has already been spoken to very fully. I would only shortly observe that the enactment is one of a very beneficial character, a wholesome enactment, intended to protect the weak and helpless. The law as it stands, is insufficient to do so, and I would simply quote two extracts from a judgment of Mr. Justice Armour, who lately gave his decision in respect to the competency of a wife to give evidence against the husband. He said:—

"The law under which the prisoner was indicted is, to my mind, a most wholesome enactment, and it must, in my opinion in nearly every case like the present, be a dead letter unless the wife, against whom the offence is committed by her husband, be permitted to testify against him."

In winding up his judgment he said :—

"I do not think that we ought, by declaring the wife to be incompetent, to render the very salutory Act under which the prisoner was convicted 'vain and useless.'"

Nothing that I could say would add force to these remarks, but I may say, and I do so most emphatically, that the Act will be a dead letter unless the wife is allowed to give her testimony in any charge preferred by her against the husband. I bow to the decision of the House. They desire that the husband also shall be a witness, and in the face of the vote that has been given, I feel it would be improper to contend against it.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the third reading of this Bill to stand until Monday, as the Bill is very important, and there is difference of opinion as to the effect of the amendment.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I would be exceedingly pleased to meet my hon. friend's suggestion, but I have been called suddenly home on a matter that will make it impossible for me to be here on Monday.

HON. MR. ALMON—I have a great many reasons for moving the resolution which I now do, that this Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be read this day three months. In the first place, I consider that all amendments to the criminal law should come from the Minister of Justice. I think that this kind of patchwork—bringing in a Bill to alter the criminal law, when we do not know what went before this amendment, or what comes after it, is not advisable. It only dropped out during the debate, that the punishment for the husband, if convicted on this evidence, is three months imprisonment. The hon. gentleman himself has just told us that this Bill, as amended, will be a dead letter if it becomes law.

HON. MR. POWER—No, no.

HON. MR. SCOTT—If the wife is not competent as a witness.

HON. MR. ALMON—If the wife is not a compellable witness under the law ?

HON. MR. GOWAN—What I said is this : I quoted the language of one of the learned judges of Ontario, Justice Armour, and what he said was this : that unless the wife was permitted (he was in the minority and differed from the judges who held that she was not allowable as a witness) the law would be a dead letter, and a very salutory enactment would fall to the ground, dead and useless.

HON. MR. ALMON—This is a piece of patch-work on the law as it stands. The Bill has already been so amended and patched by the hon. gentlemen and the lawyers who have been hackling at it since it has been before us, that it has at last got to be like a tramp's trousers—you cannot tell which is the original, and which are the emendations. When it was introduced, it provided that the wife should be a competent and compellable witness against the husband ; then it was moved that the husband should also be an allowable witness in his own behalf. I may say that the hon. gentleman from Halifax lopped off one limb ; the hon. member from Lunenburg lopped off another, and the hon. member from Amherst cut off another, and I think the Minister of Justice cut off another. With his pleasant smile, the father of the little Benjamin now asserts a doubt whether he recognizes his own child ; in fact, I think he knows as little about it, as he did about the seat of that boil that he alluded to a few days ago as having escaped the notice of the medical men. We know that eventally that boil came to a head, but where it originated we know not.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman perhaps is correct in stating that there have been one or two changes made in this Bill, but in its present shape it is an extremely simple measure, and I am quite sure when he hears it read, he will agree with me in the opinion that it is as simple as it can possibly be made. It is as follows :—

"In any prosecution of any person under this section for refusing or neglecting to provide food, clothing or lodging for his wife or children, the accused (that is the husband) and his wife, shall be competent (not compellable) to give evidence as witnesses either for or against the accused."

Nothing can be simpler than that. It allows each one to go into the box, and allows the husband to tell his own story, and the wife to tell her story. Those stories always reach the Bench, whether under oath, or not under oath. In my judgment, in cases of this kind, where both parties have such a direct interest, there is very little difference whether they are sworn or not sworn; because a judge, in a case of this kind, which is a domestic matter, naturally asks the husband to give his explanation. It is presumed that the explanation he gives in a crisis of that kind is the same as he would give under oath. I think it is always extremely important that the wife should be enabled to give her statement.

HON. MR. ALMON—It leads to perjury.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I am quite prepared to agree with the hon. gentleman in that, but there seems to be an opinion abroad that in the administration of the criminal law we should follow the lines laid down in the civil law, to allow the parties to a case to be examined under oath. A Bill was brought before the British House of Commons the other day, and was passed there, which allowed the accused in all cases, not only in misdemeanors, but in felonies, to give evidence in his own case. If there is a case in which the accused should be allowed to give evidence in his own behalf, it is in one of this kind. As the Bill now stands there can be no objection to it; both parties will be heard, and no doubt there will have to be corroborative evidence before a decision will be given for or against the accused.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—No doubt, as the hon. member from Barrie has the support of the leaders of the Government and of the Opposition, he will not fear the fate of the Bill. I may say that I regret that my hon. friend, the junior member from Halifax, has brought in this motion, because I am forced to support him from my own convictions, notwithstanding the fact that the learned gentleman from Barrie is the personification of justice, and I am disposed to give a great deal of attention to everything he says. When the hon. gentleman introduced this Bill, I was in favor of it, with certain amendments. I was opposed to anything that would have the tendency to sever the tie between husband and wife. I believe it is a tie recognized in law to be so close, that they have never been allowed to give evidence for or against each other, and this seems to be the first departure from that salutory and, I believe, just rule, and I consider it to be vicious in its tendency and effect. If we allow a measure of this kind to become law, under which the wife and husband can give evidence for or against each other, I believe it will have a dangerous tendency, and it was with that feeling in my mind I moved the amendment at another stage, that the wife's evidence should not be sufficient as against her husband without corroborative testimony. If the Bill had remained in that position, with my amendment accepted, as I thought by the House, I should have been satisfied to vote for it in that way; but when the amendment was proposed yesterday, and carried, that the husband and wife should both be competent witnesses, I considered it was a departure from all the principles that I believe to govern the rules of evidence with respect to charges between husband and wife. Although there may be some reason why such a law as this should be enacted, I do not think that the wife is exactly in the position my hon. friend says, in all cases. She usually has some connections or sympathizing friend. She is not isolated from everybody, and there will be some friend who will know of her condition if she is in want and suffering, and any merchant or neighbour will provide her with the necessaries of life, the husband can be made responsible for those necessaries in a civil action. Therefore, while this civil remedy exists, I see no reason for a law of this kind, the tendency of which will be to weaken that close relation which should always exist between husband and wife, and to lead to perjury. My hon. friend from Ottawa has given us the strongest reason why

this Bill should not become law. He says it is immaterial whether the wife and husband are sworn or not; that the Court would pay very little attention to their evidence.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman from Ottawa did not put it in that way.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—If I am misrepresenting the hon. gentleman from Ottawa, he can correct me himself. He said he considered it of very little importance whether they were sworn or not, because he considered there would be perjury somewhere, and the court would pay little attention to either of them. That is a reason why I consider they should not be brought into a court as witnesses when we feel that such would be the result. Having had considerable experience in such matters in my practice, I cannot allow this Bill to pass without my disapproval. With the amendment which I proposed, I was quite ready to accept it, because then it was not the wife's evidence alone that the conviction was based on, but upon that evidence supported by independent testimony. The Bill, as it stands, is vicious in its tendency, and has my unqualified opposition.

The House divided on the amendment, which was lost on the following division:—

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Almon,	Glasier,
Armand,	Kaulbach,
Baillargeon,	McDonald,
Bellerose,	McKay,
Bolduc,	McKindsey,
Botsford,	Montgomery,
Chaffers,	Nelson.
Chapais,	Plumb,
Clemow,	Read,
Cochrane,	Trudel,
DeBlois,	Turner.—23.
Ferguson,	

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Alexander,	Odell,
Archibald,	O'Donohoe,
Campbell, (Sir Alex.),	Pelletier,
Flint,	Poirier,
Girard,	Power,
Gowan,	Scott,
Grant,	Smith,
Haythorne,	Stevens,
McClelan,	Sutherland,
McInnes,	Vidal,
Macfarlane,	Wark.—23.
Miller (Speaker),	

The House then divided on the main motion, which was lost on the following division:—

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Alexander,	Miller (Speaker),
Archibald,	O'Donohoe,
Campbell (Sir Alex.),	Pelletier,
Dever,	Poirier,
Flint,	Power,
Girard,	Scott,
Gowan,	Smith,
Grant,	Stevens,
Haythorne,	Sutherland,
McClelan,	Vidal,
McInnes,	Wark.—23.
Macfarlane,	

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Almon,	Glasier,
Armand,	Kaulbach,
Baillargeon,	McDonald,
Bellerose,	McKay,
Bolduc,	McKindsey,
Botsford,	Montgomery,
Chaffers,	Nelson,
Chapais,	Odell,
Clemow,	Plumb,
Cochrane,	Read,
DeBlois,	Trudel,
Ferguson,	Turner.—24.

The Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Monday, May 4th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (31), "An Act to amend and consolidate the Civil Service

Acts of 1882, 1883 and 1884." He said: This Bill proposes to introduce some changes into the present Civil Service Acts. I do not find that the changes are very important. The first that I notice is in the third clause; it is to apply the Civil Service Act to the officers and employes of the Government in the North-West Territory. That has been rendered necessary by the increased forces which the Government are obliged to employ there. The 5th clause enables the Governor-in-Council, from time to time, to make rules and regulations respecting the appointments and promotions of civil servants. Sub-section 2 of the same clause provides that the supernumerary clerks shall not be eligible for increase of salary. Section 7 provides that anyone who is a member of the civil service at the time of the passing of this Act shall be classified in the class in which he has been appointed. The next clause provides that the Board of Examiners shall be supervised by the Secretary of State, and the 4th sub-section of the clause fixes the salary of each member of the board at $600 per annum.

HON. MR. SCOTT—How much have they now?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL.—They have so much a day, and it comes, in the course of the year, to about that. Each examiner receives $8 a day. There is another sub-section which allows members of the board their travelling expenses. The seventh sub-section provides for the appointment of a secretary to the board, at a salary not exceeding $1,000 per annum, with a clerk to assist him. One of the examiners now discharges the duties of secretary, and with the number of persons coming to be examined it is impossible for him to take his part in holding the examinations; therefore, it is proposed to appoint a secretary. The 47th clause of the Bill provides that when, from a temporary pressure of work, the assistance of temporary clerks becomes necessary, the Head of the Department may, on requisition of the deputy head, select from the lists of qualified candidates the necessary clerks, but such persons are not to be continued after the period in which a preliminary or qualifying examination is held, unless they present themselves for examination and obtain certificates. I think that is a very good amendment. Then sub-section *a* of section 50 has been changed to enable the deputy head to suspend an official from performance of his duty, or receipt of his salary, for misconduct or negligence. It sometimes happens that it may not be desirable to suspend an official from the performance of his duty, but it may be thought advisable to punish him for some neglect of duty, as, for instance, a mail clerk who has been careless, and this is to enable the Head of the Department, or his deputy, to punish the offender by saying to him, "you shall go on with your duty, but you shall pay a fine for what you have done." Sub-section 2 of section 51 provides that when an officer of inferior rank performs the duties of a superior officer he shall receive the same pay; I think that is eminently fair. Section 52 is as follows:

> Any officer, clerk or employe who has resigned, shall be eligible, without examination, under the authority of an Order-in-Council, to re-enter the service, at the same salary in the class in which he was serving at the time of such resignation, and provided that funds are available for the payment of his salary.

I know of two instances of this kind—a man has left the service, believing himself to be unfit to discharge his duties through some threatening complaint, who turned out afterwards to be fit for work. This clause enables the Government to avail themselves of his services.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Somebody else may have been appointed to the position in the meantime.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Then he could not be employed again in that position. Clause 53 provides that all payments of money to permanent employes, other than salaries, shall be made only under the authority of the Governor-in-Council. That is a provision to remedy a difficulty which sometimes occurs, and which certainly should be put a stop to. Sometimes a clerk stands well with his principal, and an endeavor is made to give him additional salary, and an item for that purpose is put in the Estimates. The Estimates are often made up somewhat hurriedly, and this item, with others, receives the sanction of Parliament, and this

clerk gets the money without the matter having had the consideration of the Governor-in-Council. This is to provide that even under these circumstances, although Parliament may have voted the money, yet the intervention of the Governor-in-Council will be necessary, and then, of course, their responsibility will be complete.

HON. MR. MACINNES (Burlington)—It would be a further protection if it came from the Treasury Board.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The Treasury Board only makes recommendations to the Governor-in-Council. The Governor-in-Council throughout act in that, as in kindred matters, by referring to the Treasury Board and adopting their report. There are some novelties, I think, in the schedules. I do not know at this moment of more than two. One is that a superintendant of letter carriers may be appointed at a salary not exceeding $800.

HON. MR. SCOTT—A new office?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—A new office, in name at all events. The duty has been discharged in some of the larger offices—in Montreal I believe, in Toronto, I know—by a clerk. There are a great many letter carriers in a place like Toronto, I believe upwards of 100, and in dealing with so many employés it is desirable that some one man should be the master to see that they got out with their letters at the proper hour, that they return in proper time, that they take all the letters —supervise in that way the letter carriers in the complete performance of their duties. It has been found, in Toronto I know, to be attended with very good results, and the work has been done, not under this name of Superintendent of Letter Carriers, but a clerk has attended to it and seen that they carried out the rules of the Department, that discipline has been maintained and that they were all fit for duty. It is a complete supervision over that branch of the service, and I believe that this is a very valuable improvement. The system obtains only in 6 or 7 of the larger cities. There is also a change in some part of the Bill in the number of persons who may be appointed to office without examination.

HON. MR. POWER—That is the deputy-collector of Inland Revenue. He is substituted for the collector. It is in clause 37, sub-section 2. It is an improvement as far as it goes.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The collectors are responsible for the correct discharge of their duties, and require a technical education. For instance, they must know how to calculate the strength of liquors, and know the various qualities of cigars, &c. Technical knowledge of that kind would be required by the collector, although the deputy-collector may be brought in without examination and without reference to the rules for promotion prescribed in the Act.

These are the changes; the House will perceive that they are not very great. The Bill excited a great deal of interest in the other branch of Parliament, but I think that was because the other House saw proper to discuss the measure, as though it were an entirely new matter, and the civil service system was being introduced for the first time. The House will see that the changes are of no great importance in themselves, and perhaps the more convenient way would have been to have introduced a separate Bill containing only the amendments. However, there is something to be said on the other side even in that respect, because it is desirable in a bill of this kind to have it presented in whole. I hope the House will not object to the amendments which have been proposed. They are sought because experience has shown that they are desirable in the interest of the civil service.

HON. MR. MACINNES (Burlington)—As this Bill is founded mainly upon the report of the commission which was appointed in 1880, and of which I happened to be a member, I think I shall make a few observations with reference to it. The commission was appointed to inquire into the needs and condition of the civil service, and the plan which we adopted was something like this: we summoned witnesses from all the different Departments of the inside service for the purpose of obtaining their evidence. A small subcommittee was appointed by the commission also to visit the various offices of the inside service, to examine into the

system of accounts. That sub-committee consisted of Mr. Barbeau and myself, and we made as thorough an examination into the system of accounts as we possibly could. Committees from the commission were also appointed to examine into the condition of the outside service in the various cities throughout the Dominion—Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, and I am not sure whether London was visited or not; but all these important points were visited for the purpose of examining witnesses and finding out the condition of the civil service in all of them. We had also placed before us by the Government documents relating to the civil service of Great Britain and France, and other countries. We had these various reports and documents published along with the report and evidence taken, and they will be found in the Sessional Papers of 1880–81, and will be interesting reading to anyone who takes an interest in the subject. We thought it would be convenient to publish them in that form, so that they will always be ready for reference in the Parliamentary Library. We found a good deal to reform in the various departments of the service. We found that the general expense, in a great many cases, was needlessly increased, mainly by salaries which were paid in this way: we found that officers of the higher grade were performing duties which ought to have been assigned to third-class clerks, and in that way the expense of the service was needlessly increased. We also found that the structural arrangements of the Departments was very inconvenient, and it also needlessly added to the expense, because of so many small rooms which cause unecessary subdivision of the work, and strong recommendations were made by the commission on that point. However, it is excessively difficult to change the structure of buildings after they are erected; but as the Government are now about to erect new offices in Ottawa, no doubt attention will be paid to that important point, because it is very important that clerks shall be in large rooms where they will come under the supervision of their superior officer. We found that the system of appointment by successive governments was defective; that the best men were not always appointed; that, in fact, they were largely selected through political influence and personal favoritism.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MACINNES—We found on reading over the documents which were submitted to us that up to the end of 1855 the civil service of Great Britain was in a deplorable condition, arising, as we read, from the same cause—from the manner in which appointments and promotions were made in the service. So great was the evil that leading statesmen of both parties united to bring about a reform in that respect, and a commission was appointed, on whose report a system was adopted under which the civil service of Great Britain has, from being one of the most defective, become one of the most efficient probably in the world. Having that example before us, we deemed it our duty to recommend the adoption of a system which had brought about such satisfactory results for our Mother Country. For we are British Canadians, or Canadian British, but above all things we are British, and we felt that it ought to be the desire of every one in this country to perpetuate British institutions on this continent; therefore we were very largely guided in our recommendations by the system existing in Great Britain. On the recommendation of the Civil Service Commisaion in 1880, an Act was passed under which all persons entering the civil service must pass a preliminary and qualifying examination, and there was also a period of probation insisted upon—a period of six months before permanent appointment, in order that the fitness of the party selected might be ascertained If found efficient and useful he was appointed permanently; if found to be inefficient he was not appointed. We also recommended, and this Bill before us embodies that recommendation, that promotion by merit should exist in the service, and a system of examination is adopted before making promotions, in order to ascertain the fitness of the officer for promotion. Then, with reference to the salaries, a good deal has been said on the point of annual increments—that is, the third-class clerk to be appointed at a certain salary, and he gets a certain

advance annually as here stated in the Bill. The question is which is the better system—a system of that kind in which the clerk gets an increase every year, or a system of paying so much as a mean. In the United States, I think a third-class clerk gets $1,000, and his salary continues at that. My own opinion is in favor of our system, because if a clerk only remains a short time in the service and gets the $1,000, of course the country is paying more for his services; if he remains under our system we are paying less, and then it is an encouragement for him to perform his duty. Then there has been a good deal said about the superannuation. Our Superannuation Act is admitted to be a very good Act. My own opinion is that it is an excellent Act, and properly administered can be made largely to contribute to the economy of the service. For example, as I have already stated we found superior officers, men receiving superior pay, doing the work of inferior clerks. It is manifest that a change should be made in that respect; that an officer receiving high class pay for doing low class work, should be removed; but it would be a great hardship to remove him without compensation. The Superannuation Act enables the Government to get rid of the services of the inefficient in that way; it is only a question of judgment and discretion, how far that power can be exercised, or should be exercised. In Great Britain, the superannuation is entirely paid by the Government: that is, they make no reductions whatever from the salary of the civil servant; it is wholly paid by the Government. It was a question that was discussed in the House of Commons in England, very thoroughly and very ably, and it ended in a system being adopted of the Government paying the whole of the cost of the superannuation of civil servants. Objections are made to our Superannuation Act, because it makes no provision for the widows and children of deceased civil servants. It should be borne in mind that the Act was never intended to do anything of that kind; it was only intended as a pension to civil servants themselves. The commission of which I had the honor of being chairman, took up the question of making provision for widows and orphans of civil servants. We discussed it at great length, and gave it a great deal of attention, and we recommended the Government to adopt a system of life insurance for the civil service, and making a deduction from their salaries to pay for their premiums, in the same manner that the superannuation deductions are now made. Our recommendations were not, however, adopted. It is a very difficult question—a question that has been discussed elsewhere, as well as here; but it appears to me to be a very important matter indeed, that the widows and children of deceased civil servants should have some provision made for them, if the officers themselves do not do so; and as a rule, I fancy it is more honored in the breach than in the observance. Then, with reference to the expense of superannuation, I think there is a great deal of misapprehension with reference to it. The cost of the state of superannuation is not so large as it is generally supposed to be. The statements which are laid before Parliament yearly, are incomplete. They simply show the amounts received from the civil servants by those deductions, on the one hand, and on the other they show the amounts which are paid out for superannuation. No account is taken, however, in those statements, of the indirect savings to the country, which the Government are enabled to make owing to the Superannuation Act. Take for example, an office that is found to be needless, and it is, therefore, desirable that it should be abolished, and that the officer occupying it should be disposed of in some way. It would be cruel to discharge him altogether, but under the Superannuation Act he is provided for and the office is abolished. In a case of that kind it is a clear gain to the Government, which the Superannuation Act enables them to make. Then there are other cases where an office is abolished, the holder of which was receiving high pay; but his services can be dispensed with under the Superannuation Act, and the difference between the salary paid him, and his superannuation allowance, is saved to the state. The Civil Service Commission in 1880, requested the different departments to prepare statements of the working of the Superannuation Act in that way, and hon. gentlemen will find in the Sessional Papers of 1880–81, those statements along with

the report and the other statements to which I have already alluded. There can be no question that the different Acts which have been passed since the report of the commission was made to Parliament, are the best we have ever had in this country. They have not, perhaps, gone the length of the recommendations made by the commission, but it appears to me that the Act is quite abreast with public opinion. I cannot sit down without stating that the Act itself, and the improvements made in it, are very largely due to the leader of this House, and the leader of the Government as well. When we were appointed to perform this duty we were left perfectly untramelled; it is our own report; we had no suggestions made to us from anybody; we simply went to work and made as thorough and conscientious an inquiry into the condition of the civil service as we could, and made our report accordingly, and upon our report the Acts of 1882, and the amendments thereto, were founded. When this Bill is in the committee, there are some clauses to which I shall consider it my duty to ask for some amendments.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman from Ottawa asked what the present salary of the Board of Examiners is, and I said that it is $8 a day, and that it would amount to about the same sum as is provided by this Bill, but I see that it does not. The present vote is $5 a day, but the time is not to exceed 60 days—in all, that would be only $300. The gentleman who is a member of the examining board, and who is also secretary, gets the salary now that it is proposed to give by this Bill, so that there is no additional salary there.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—This Bill introduced to amend and consolidate the Civil Service Act, as far as I have been able to investigate the matter, appears to be drawn with care, and its provisions in general appear to be in the public interest.

HON. MR. MACINNES, (Burlington). Hear! hear!

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—If the provisions of the Act were only faithfully carried out, I do not think there would be much to complain of. The salaries of the officers of the civil service are certainly not excessive. We desire that gentlemen holding positions in the different departments should be able to live respectably, and that they should be enabled to educate their families and clothe them respectably, and in every way live in a manner becoming their position. There are one or two clauses in the Bill to which, when the House goes into committee, I will venture to move amendments. I think that one of the crying evils of the system is the abuse of the Civil Service Act, and not the carrying of it out faithfully. As was observed to me the other day, when walking along the streets of Ottawa, by a Conservative Senator, while we met a number of superannuated officers in the full vigor of life, superannuated upon salaries of nearly $2,000 a year—"Good God, it is dreadful to meet such men, in the full vigor of life, superannuated for some object, probably for some political purpose." It is simply dreadful to see such men superannuated on large salaries, causing a large waste of public money. This is a fact that is not denied. It may be alleged by the present Government that their predecessors did the same thing. However, two wrongs do not make a right, and I protest against government after government perpetuating such a system. What are we here for as members of Parliament, if it is not to endeavor to check this system of selfishness and corruption, and waste of public money from year to year? Another crying evil is, that we have found the Government violating the principles of justice and right, bringing their own relatives into the service and placing them over the heads of old public officers who have served for forty years in the public service, because of their political power. What sort of justice is that? I find in this Bill a very objectionable clause. I refer to No. 5, one of the new clauses, which I hope this House will expunge. It provides that the Governor-in-Council may, from time to time, make general rules and regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, respecting appointments and promotions of the officers in the civil service, "and all other matters pertaining thereto." Why should the Government have this

power? What is the use of our enacting a measure if we are to give the Government full power to do as they like?

HON. MR. POWER—Not to do anything inconsistent with the Act.

HON MR. ALEXANDER—Does not that clause bear the impress that they want to use that power in contravention of the Act, and for political objects? When they want to reward some one who has rendered political services, either by bribing the electors or in some other way, that they will be enabled to place him in some public office, and make a vacancy for that purpose. If he is a man who has sacrificed honor and principle for the sake of party, they may then be enabled by this Act to compensate him. Could any clause be better drawn to enable them to corrupt the people of this country? It appears to me that for some time there has been an effort on the part of the Government to lead the multitude to look for office. We find from end to end of Ontario—I cannot speak for the province of Quebec or the Maritime Provinces—but there is a prevailing feeling amongst those that are unfortunate to look to the ministers to give them office, so they may obtain their sustenance from the public treasury. This reminds me very much of an anecdote: a British nobleman visited Henry Clay at his beautiful place in Kentucky, on which occasion Mr. Clay, one day after breakfast, asked his guest if he would take a walk over his domain. In their ramble they came to a shady grove, where they found a number of troughs, when Mr. Clay took from his pocket some grain and salt, which he scattered in the troughs and giving a loud, shrill sound from a whistle which he carried in his pocket, hogs came towards him from every direction, upon which Mr. Clay remarked to the nobleman—"do you see that swinish multitude? They are typical of the hungry office seekers that surround the President of the United States after a presidential election." And so we find this country full of hungry office seekers, who zealously entered their appearance at those great demonstrations last autumn in honor of the first minister of this country at Montreal and Toronto. I do not mean to say that all those who participated in those demonstrations were such office seekers, but one of them came to me at the Queen's Hotel, Toronto, after the grand demonstration there, swearing and saying, "I have spent a large amount of money going to those demonstrations, and I have been humbugged long enough with promises; I will not go to another." We have thus some idea of the nature of those public demonstrations, which might thus be composed of 2,000 office seekers crowding after him, just like the multitude that came to the shrill sound of Henry Clay's whistle. I have nothing further to say with regard to this Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—I think what the Minister of Justice said with respect to the form of this Bill is sound; but there was a reason for introducing it in the shape in which it has come up. If the minister will look at the chapter of the consolidated statutes respecting the civil service, he will see that the Bill, as introduced in the other House, was a transcript of that chapter, with the desired amendments inserted. I suppose the object is to substitute this for that chapter in the consolidated statutes.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The amendments are inserted in italics.

HON. MR. POWER—As a matter of mechanical convenience, it was a wise course to take. We have had several discussions on civil service bills; and this time we are fortunate in having present, and taking part in the discussion, and giving us a great deal of valuable information in connection with the matter, the hon. gentleman whom we may look upon as the father of this system. I could detect running through the hon. gentleman's speech, however, a certain melancholy strain; and I do not wonder because, looking at the report which he made as chairman of the commission, and at the law in which that report is supposed to be embodied, I think the father finds it difficult to recognize his own offspring. Unless I am misinformed, the commission of which my hon. friend was the head, recommended that admission to the civil service should be by competitive examination. That I think is the essential feature of a really good civil service sys-

tem; but, unfortunately, that essential feature is omitted from the system as we have it here. The hon. gentleman said, and he stated it as a melancholy fact, that at the time this commission was appointed, political influence had a great deal to do with the appointments.

HON. MR. MACINNES—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. POWER—I am glad to know that I did not misinterpret my hon. friend. The fact is, that under the present system, political influence makes the appoinsments just as it did before; but there it this improvement now, that political influence cannot appoint a man who is utterly ignorant. That is the only change.

HON. MR. MACINNES—A man must be of the requisite age.

HON. MR. POWER—Yes.

HON. MR. MACINNES — And they were formerly appointed without being of the requisite age.

HON. MR. POWER—There is that little improvement—the candidate must be of the requisite age, and must possess a certain amount of information.

HON. MR. PLUMB—That is a good deal.

HON. MR. POWER—It is something; but the essential feature of a good civil service system does not exist. A hundred candidates go up for examination under the present system, and the examinations as a rule are easy. The Government, in making an appointment, may take the lowest man who passed, and appoint him to fill the first vacancy that occurs. I am not aware that there are any cases where the political leanings of the candidate have been overlooked. So far as political influence is concerned, it is felt almost as much as ever.

HON. MR. MACINNES—It is an open competition.

HON. MR. POWER—My hon. friend has stated that he proposes to move one amendment. I hope it will be to that clause of the Bill, and that he will move that in future the persons who come out best in the examination shall be appointed, and then we shall have competitive examinations and get clear of political influence. The hon. gentleman also referred to another matter which does not come directly before us; but it is a matter of a good deal of consequence and one which has been discussed in this House on two or three occasions—the question of civil service superannuation. It appears that the Government did not adopt what the commission recommended. The recommendation must be recognized as a very much better system than the one which now prevails. That is a system resembling life insurance, under which the widows and children of servants who die in the Government employ, should receive something.

HON. MR. MACINNES—No, we did not recommend such an amendment. That is an entirely different Bill from the one which is before us.

HON. MR. POWER—But that system was recommended.

HON. MR. MACINNES—We made no such recommendation to amend the Civil Service Act, as it stood then, or as it stands now.

HON. MR. POWER—I understood that my hon. friend recommended that system of life insurance, and did not think it was to be in addition to superannuation. It is to be regretted that some such system has not been introduced; because now it is sometimes thought desirable to dispense with the services of an officer for one knows not what reason, and he is superannuated with a large allowance; and we find him, as the hon. member from Woodstock stated, looking for employment in other ways, quite energetic, active and able to do his business, though drawing a large amount of public money; while in the case of a servant who dies in the public service, who has saved nothing whatever, and leaves a helpless widow and children, the law makes no provision. It must strike everyone that this is a most unsatisfactory and inequitable system. There is no doubt that this superannuation has

been abused; we have discussed that before. If you look at the estimates this year you will find that there are about $200,000 estimated for superannuations alone. That is a tremendous sum for a poor and thinly-peopled country like this. It is about one-fifth of the whole money paid for civil service purposes. That is clearly an abuse, and if hon. gentlemen will look at the returns which have been brought down from time to time they will see that what was intended to meet an exceptional case, the provision that a number of years should be added to the period of service of an officer who is about to be superannuated, has been made the general rule, and that in very few cases have officers been superannuated on the allowance to which they were strictly entitled. I have ventured to say so much on the general question; although perhaps strictly we ought to deal only with the new matter in this Bill—at least that might have been more convenient for the Government. As to the new portion of the Bill, I wish to say this, that most of the amendments which have been mentioned by the Hon. Minister of Justice, in my humble opinion, are improvements. The two most important alterations that this Bill makes in the civil service law are—first, that the whole matter of the civil service is put under the supervision of the Secretary of State.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Oh. no; only the examining board.

HON. MR. POWER—The board shall be supervised by the Secretary of State.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is only the Board of Examiners.

HON. MR. POWER—That is an important matter.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It merely gives it to one man instead of the Council.

HON. MR. MACINNES—Formerly it was the Governor-in-Council.

HON. MR. POWER—I should have much more confidence in the Board of which the Minister of Justice was a member, than I would have in a single officer such as the gentleman who is to supervise this board now. It is most desirable now, following out the intentions of the commission of which the hon. gentleman behind me was chairman, that this examining board should be kept as free as possible from every suspicion of political influence; and I think the fact that the board is to be directly supervised by the Secretary of State is calculated to increase rather than to diminish the political influence over the examiners. That is one change which does not deserve approval, and the other is the change in the mode of payment of the examining board. The cost of this examining board is very considerably increased. The utmost amount that one of those examiners could get under the law as it has existed, was $300, in addition to his travelling expenses. Under this Bill, each member gets not merely the maximum that he could get under the old system, but he gets double the amount of the old maximum, $600. There is to be a secretary. Under the existing law the secretary was to be a member of the board of examiners, so that there were only two members and a secretary, receiving $1,600 in all. Now, there are to be three members, receiving $600 each, and a secretary whose salary is fixed at $1,000, so that the expense of the board has been about doubled. I think, when we come to look at the actual position of affairs, that increase will appear the more objectionable. The fact is that under the examinations which have already been held, a larger number of candidates have passed than will be required to fill places for the next two or three years. As the law existed before, there need be very little expense incurred, if it was deemed unnecessary to hold examinations. I do not see the necessity of holding some four examinations each year when there are so large a number of persons who have qualified.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—There are only two examinations per annum.

HON. MR. POWER—Supplemental examinations are held.

HON. MR. MACINNES—We are assisting to educate the people.

HON. MR. POWER—The matter of education has been left to the local governments ; I do not think it is our business to educate men. If these examinations had no other effect than to educate these young men, there might not be so much objection to it. We may educate them, although I doubt if we do ; as a rule, I think they receive their educations elsewhere, and after being educated they come to pass these examinations. The result of holding out inducements to young men to pass these examinations is that we make them waiters upon Providence.

HON. MR. MACINNES—Hear, hear !

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman seems to be amused, but it is a serious matter. There are, I understand, about 1,200 young men who have passed these examinations. Here are these young men who, but for the inducements held out by this system, would go to make their livings at some independent enterprise, who are now trusting to Providence, or trusting to the good will of the Government which we have been told is a particular friend of Providence, for something to do bye and bye. I think that is a very unfortunate state of things.

HON. MR. MACINNES—Large numbers of these civil service candidates who have passed the examinations are picked up by outsiders, such as banks, insurance companies and others, just as the best of them are in Great Britain. They see the list of the young men who have passed those examinations, and they immediately avail themselves of the opportunity of picking them up and giving them employment.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It answers as a first-class recommendation ; they are well known everywhere.

HON. MR. POWER—I am glad that my hon. friend's experience has been of that kind ; I cannot say that my own has. It may occasionally happen that a young man who passes this examination is taken into the service of a bank or an insurance company, but I presume that they would have taken him at any rate. The banks have never found much difficulty heretofore in getting clerks, and I do not think that it is our business to supply them. This Bill examplifies a tendency which is too strong in Canada altogether, that when a comparatively trifling expense would have enabled the Government to hold all the examinations necessary, they fasten on the country an expensive piece of machinery, which, whether the work is necessary or not, will go on turning out candidates who are not required at all, at great expense to the country. I think that this particular alteration in the Act is a change altogether in the wrong direction, and I am very sorry to see it. I presume, as to the details of the Bill, that there will be an opportunity to discuss them in committee.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I intended to address a few remarks to the House, but the subject has been pretty exhaustively treated ; I may, however, say something more, at a future stage. I have not taken much interest in civil service legislation, because I have never had the smallest faith in it. It is a very good thing in theory, but it is not really carried out. The chief objection I have found to it is the very one to which the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has adverted ; that is, it is stimulating a large number of young men, all over the country, to believe that, by passing an examination, they will get an appointment to the civil service. They have come in hundreds and passed the examination, and that has been the end of it. When the Government want to make an appointment, they do not look to the large number of young men who, at very considerable expense to themselves, have passed examinations, but appoint somebody who has political influence—someone who has been put in as a supernumerary clerk, and told to work up and be prepared to pass the examination.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman should not say that the Government disregard the law—that when they want a supernumerary clerk they take him from outside the list altogether.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I do not like to make a strong statement, but I venture to say, if we could get now the names of those who had been employed during the

last year, we would find that a very considerable number have been put on as extra clerks, who have not passed the examination. The Government can pass an Order-in-Council by which, for a limited time, supernumerary clerks can be paid, and thus they can override the Auditor General.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The Order-in-Council can only be for one month.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Only for one month at a time; they can pass another Order-in-Council for the next month, and another, for the next.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There are supernumerary clerks who were employed anterior to the passing of the Civil Service Act, and those have been kept on.

HON. MR. SCOTT—For the reason which I have given, I have never taken much interest in the Civil Service Bills. I was rather interested in the speech made by the hon. Senator from Burlington in which he told us in very glowing terms of all the trips the commissioners had made and all the sittings they had held in the various towns of Canada, collecting information. I should have felt more gratified if the suggestions he had made were being carried out in the same spirit as the system is being carried out in England, but we shall have to move very considerably out of the political circle in which we move here before we arrive at the condition of affairs that prevails there; because it cannot be for a moment imagined that all the young men in the country are on the Conservative side—that there are no young men on the Liberal side who are fit for appointment to the civil service. The fact is, we find that the appointments are made entirely from among the friends of the Government. I venture to say that if you take the number of appointments made from those who had passed the Board before they were appointed at all, you will discover that the percentage is very, very small. I do not suppose there would be anything like 10 per cent.; so here we have 90 per cent. of the appointments made from persons who were not examined before their appointment, and not from amongst the young men of the country who have been led by false representations to look for Government positions, and have been waiting on Providence, looking to the Government and believing the time might come when they would receive an appointment. I have, myself, frequently been appealed to by gentlemen, who have said "I have passed the civil service examination and I want an appointment." I have invariably said, "unless your application is backed up by two or three strong friends of the Government, your have no chance of getting an appointment." It is new to me to hear that the banks and other prominent institutions of the country pick up those young men who pass these examinations. I should be very glad if that were the case, but no instance of the kind has come under my observation. There may be isolated cases, but I doubt very much whether these examinations form a preliminary to the appointment of young men to banking or commercial houses. I should be very glad to hear that it was the rule; it would have an excellent effect, but those companies generally select their men from the best material they can find at hand, whether they pass civil service examinations or not. I was not aware, though I should be very glad to hear that it was the case, that a certificate from the Board of Examiners gave a young man a status in the country. However, on that point I may be wrong, but I repeat, not a single case has come under my observation in which passing the civil service examination has obtained a situation for a young man. The hon. gentleman from Burlington introduced the subject of civil service superannuation and justified the system. I do not propose to go into the subject further than to point out this fact, which is patent, that year by year this amount is swelling up enormously, and it is out of all proportion (and the proportion is becoming greater each year) to the moneys paid in. I have not had time to look over these returns, but I think it is in the neighborhood of $175,000 or $180,000 that was paid last year. Does not that

seem a monstrous sum, particularly with the knowledge that there are men all over this country who feel that they are capable of earning a living for themselves, who are enjoying very handsome annuities, from $800 to $1,800 a year. I could name several men who are yet in their prime, but who have been disposed of simply to make room for some favorite, or because they did not get along, perhaps, with the deputy head or some one else in the Department, and consequently they had to be shunted. There is no doubt about that. If we run over the names of those who are on the superannuation list, we will find a very considerable proportion of them fit for public service—quite as fit as many who are in the service now. My hon. friend points out that there is some advantage gained, because an office has been abolished or you are getting another man to perform the service at a lower salary. I only point out that the sum that we are paying year by year is enormously increasing; that we are paying more to the employes of the Government. The figures during the last six or eight years have been increasing continuously, by 10 or 15 per cent. and that is considerably added to by the superannuation allowances. You are employing two men to do the work that one did before, and that is adding very considerably to the cost of the extension of civil government in this country. Of course it is a question that ought not to be discussed now, because hon. gentlemen have not the figures before them, but the hon. member from Burlington, in his anxiety to say a great deal in favor of the commission and the recommendations they had made, has chosen to speak of the subject of superannuation, which I think is not deserving of the favor that he asks for it, because I think it is a serious blemish on our system that we pay so many men now, who are quite capable of serving the country, a handsome annuity in order that others may be put in their places.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—With regard to competitive examinations helping young men to obtain situations, I can endorse the remark of the hon. member from Burlington.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—How many cases do you know of?

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—I know only two cases of my own knowledge, both in Montreal. In one the young man was appointed to a commercial house, and in the other to a bank, in consequence, I believe, of having passed this examination. How many others there may be I do not know. I believe the examination is a very stringent one, from what I have been told by those who have failed to pass it. It is a great protection to the public in the appointment of civil servants. No doubt there may be some young men who wait for the sweet bye and bye, until their friends get into power, but I think generally those who pass the examination find their way into other occupations, waiting for the time when they may have a chance of getting an appointment to the civil service. No doubt there is some trouble in these civil service superannuations. Perhaps ten years may be allowed to a man to get rid of him, in order to abolish the office or something of that kind. I believe the system is open to corruption, though how far it has been abused by this Government or any other I do not know; I have never inquired into it. I think the civil service examinations have blocked the overdue influence which was exercised on the Government for appointments to the civil service. No doubt the public offices had been crammed by persons not qualified for such positions. I believe that the public service might be performed as efficiently as it is now done, with two-thirds of the present number of civil servants. Many of them are only an incubus on the service of the country, and I hope the Government will be able to get rid of them.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—Talking about superannuation of officials, reminds me of a matter with which I am quite familiar. I do not wish to say which class of politicians the matter happened under, but the incident to which I am about to refer occurred some ten or eleven years ago. I know three cases. The first is that of a gentleman who was superannuated, for age I understood, and if I wanted a man to go to the North-West to-day to lead a company to put down the rebellion, I do not know a man in the province that I would prefer before him. He is walking

about the streets at present, unoccupied, and he must be now for ten years at least receiving an allowance of $808.56 a year. His salary had been $1,250 a year. I refer now to another gentleman, who is receiving an allowance of $1,400 a year. His salary had been $2,000. I think he was superannuated about the same time as the one to whom I have just referred. He is a gentleman, and always was a gentleman, but I do not see that he should have the public money for nothing any more than anyone else; but he is receiving it, and has been receiving it for the last ten or eleven years—at all events I think it was under the previous Government that these were superannuated.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. DEVER—He was replaced by another gentleman, who received a salary in the neighborhood of $2,500 or $3,000 a year to do the work that his predecessor had done for $2,000 a year. I also know another gentleman who was appointed in the place of one of those superannuated officers, and instead of giving him what the former officer had, he got some $2,000 a year for doing what had been done by the party who was superannuated for $1,250. The man who received the $2,000 a year was perhaps the most unfit that could be picked out of the population of St. John for such a situation. He was an old man when he was appointed, a helpless man, unfit in every respect to fill the office he was appointed to, and totally unfit to be a substitute for the man who had been superannuated.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—How long ago was that?

HON. MR. DEVER—It was during the previous administration. That gentleman who was receiving $2,000 a year was by some means or other superannuated on an allowance of $500 a year, and he is now a citizen of the United States, and has been for several years, though he is drawing his superannuation allowance. I mention those three instances to show to what an extent this superannuation system may be abused. Men are superannuated who are quite competent to do their work, and others are put in their places.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Is there anything about superannuation in this Bill at all?

HON. MR. DEVER—I have no reference to this Bill at all; I am only telling you what came under my notice, in reply to some remarks that had fallen from an hon. gentleman in reference to the abuse of this superannuation clause. I say that those things have happened, and they are going on now, and there is a waste of public money in consequence.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I wish to draw from the hon. gentleman from Burlington, if possible, some explanation with reference to the examinations. As he has been chairman of the commission, no doubt he is in a position to state to the House how those examinations are conducted, and what becomes of the examination papers of the candidates. It is manifestly a matter of great importance that the Government should obtain the services of the most competent candidates, and that their names and qualifications should be known to all the world, and to the candidates themselves. I think that the end contemplated by competitive examinations will not be attained, unless the full results of those examinations are made public. Hon. gentlemen have stated that large numbers of both candidates remain for a lengthened period after the examination waiting for appointments which never come, so they take employment as it offers in other businesses. In the meantime, perhaps, vacancies occur in the public service, and the list is taken up and a random selection is made from the well-known supporters of the Government. Now, if a system of this sort prevails, and continues, it is obvious that the civil service will, in a comparatively short time, be filled by men who are supporters of the existing government, particularly if that government happened to be long in office, and that I conceive would be a manifest evil. The remedy for this state of things is that the best men should be appointed, and that all the candidates should have their papers returned to them, in order that they may see how many marks they receive at the examination, wherein they failed, and how they came to fail. If this system were pursued there would be no complaint of injustice, so far as examina-

tions are concerned, and all the candidates would know precisely how far the attainments of their fellow candidates extended. I have risen to give the hon. gentleman from Burlington an opportunity to clear up this doubt, and I think many members of this House would be grateful for this information, and I am sure a great many candidates who have not heretofore obtained Government situations, will then understand how it came about that they failed.

Hon. Mr. MacINNES (Burlington)—With reference to the candidates who come up to be examined by the civil service commissioners, the hon. gentleman will of course understand that they belong to all classes—to his side of politics, as well as to our side, so that there is no selection in that respect. It is open and competitive as far as that is concerned.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE — How about the marks and the papers?

Hon. Mr. MacINNES—First of all I will point out to the hon. gentleman that, according to the present Act, immediately after the examination, a list of the candidates who have passed is made out and published in the *Canada Gazette.* As regards the examination papers, they are, I think, written papers which are sent to the office of the Secretary of State.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE—There is the evil.

Hon. Mr. MacINNES—Where is the evil? What are we to do with them?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—There is no rateing; they are all put on an equal basis, though they are not equal as to marks. Some must have been very much better than others; some must have had more marks than others, and I think the most pertinent proposition is that the world should know which candidates passed the best examination, just as they do now in the Military College examination. There is an illustration; the Imperial Government give commissions to the four best graduates each year. Why not adopt an examination of that kind? It is a star chamber business now; the examinations are made, the board decide, and the public never see the papers—no one ever sees the papers except the government.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—The marks can be seen, if any person desires to see the papers. The examination papers are kept for a year and then destroyed. The names of the successful candidates are published in the *Canada Gazette.* It would not be fair to publish the names of unsuccessful candidates, and therefore they do not do so; but the names of the successful men are published.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I understood that they were put in sections. Those who secure up to 60 marks are put in one section; all up to 70 are put in another; all up to 80 are put in another, and so on, and the highest grade is put at the head of the list.

Hon. Sir. ALEX. CAMPBELL—That I believe to be the case. As to the publication of the names of the successful candidates, that is provided for by the 34th clause.

Hon. Mr. POWER—It does not say in the order of merit.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, but that I believe to be the case—that it is in the order in which they passed that they are published. It would be manifestly unfair to publish the names of the unsuccessful candidates. It is no hardship to those young men to go up for examination. It is an episode in their lives. If a young man goes to a bank or to a railway company and does not get employment he tries his chance for the civil service, and he goes through the examination. If he does not get employment then it does not waste his time, it does not make him dissipated, and it does not damage him in any way. He simply tries his chances for the civil service, and what harm does it do him? The hon. gentleman says that a number go away disappointed. There is no help for that. You cannot appoint 500 because 500 candidates have succeeded in passing. The hon. gentleman says we ought to open the civil service to those who are qualified; but he does not suppose that all

the men who have passed the civil service examination—some 1,500 up to the present time—are waiting to be employed, still resting on their oars, and doing nothing? There is no suggestion of that kind. This only means that they take their chances for employment in the civil service of the country. They pass the examination, and if it fails they try something else. It does them no harm, and only fastens in their minds the knowledge that they have, and qualifies them better far other employment.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Both the leader of the Government and the hon. gentleman who was chairman of the commission, have, I think, shrunk from answering the point which I brought to their notice.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman did not ask me any question.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—That is not the question in this case; it is the position of the candidates. The examiners may place the candidates where they please, and the public has no opportunity of knowing how the candidates got there. The candidate may be conscious, himself, that he has passed a successful examination, yet he finds himself far down on the list. The only check on that sort of thing is the return of the papers to the candidates.

HON. MR. PLUMB—They all know what the result is.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE — The leader of the Government and the chairman of the civil service commission have not touched on that point, nor is there any provision in the Bill for this rational arrangement. If hon. gentlemen would look at the results of such examinations as those of Sandhurst and Woolwich, examinations conducted upon the most exact and fair principles, as well as being very rigid, they would find there the number of marks made by every candidate in the columns of the *Times*, and it is also well known that the commissions which result from those examinations are given mostly to men who have stood at the head of the list, without fear or favor; but under this system there is no security that the man who passes a good examination will stand high on the list, or that he will obtain employment. This is a state of things that ought not to be permitted to endure.

HON. MR. POIRIER (in French)—I was pleased to hear what the Minister of Justice said concerning the manner in which the lists of the successful candidates are made. That being the case, there should be no difficulty in adding to clause 34 such words as would embody his declaration—that is, directing and obliging the Board of Examiners to put those who pass the most successful examination, and secure the greatest number of marks, at the head of the list in the order of merit. This would be an inducement to aspirants to work for the position, and would at the same time enable the Government to select at once the very best of the candidates for positions in the service.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

INFECTIOUS OR CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (34), "An Act respecting Infectious or Contagious Diseases affecting Cattle."

HON. MR. POWER—Clause 29 says that "every such regulation shall have the like force and effect as if it had been embodied in the Act." Is it not possible that under that clause a regulation, which was inconsistent with the Act, would be made to override the Act? Because we expressly say that the regulation, without any limitation at all, is to have the effect of law. I think these regulations should be such as are not inconsistent with the Act.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman will see that the subjects on which regulations are to be made are definitely mentioned in the various sub-

sections of clause 27. These are the only ones about which Orders-in-Council shall be passed. We might make the amendment which the hon. member suggests, but I do not think it is necessary.

HON. MR. POWER—I only asked the question; I did not urge it. I would ask the Minister if he does not think that the 40th clause is very stringent—"every person who moves, or causes or allows to be moved, &c?" It provides a severe penalty for any one who "allows" any of these things to be moved.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—That is only in cases where a person has power to prevent, and does not prevent the removal.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That would only apply of course to railway and steamship companies, and the evil is so great and so much to be deprecated that I do not think we should hesitate to pass the clause.

HON. MR. NELSON, from the committee, reported the Bill with amendments, which were concurred in.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE FORCE BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (T), "An Act respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force." He said: This is a Bill to put the members of the Mounted Police, when they are serving with the militia, under Military Law. As it is now, the members of the Mounted Police are enlisted under their own Acts. A doubt has arisen whether they are amenable to the Military Law or not, and this is to remove that doubt and to place them in the same position as the other men who are serving in the militia under the Queen's regulations.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

WEST ONTARIO PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY'S BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. MR. PLUMB moved that the amendments made by the Committee on Railways, Telegraphs and Harbors, to Bill (94), "An Act to incorporate the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company," be concurred in. He said: The chairman of the Committee on Railways explained, in the House last Friday, that some amendments had been made to this Act, none of which are of importance. It was deemed best, however, that they should be left over until to-day. I can explain the amendments as they were made if the House desire it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—They were explained on Friday.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was then read the third time and passed.

RUSH LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY AND NAVIGATION COMPANY'S BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. MR. GIRARD moved that the amendments made by the Committee on Railways, Telegraphs and Harbors to Bill (79) "An Act to incorporate the Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Navigation Company," be concurred in. He said: I do not intend to go into the details of these amendments unless the House desires an explanation. I have carefully examined the amendments, and I find in them nothing which would render them objectionable to the House. They are rather an improvement in the interests of the public than anything else.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was then read the third time and passed.

The Senate adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Tuesday, May 5th, 1885.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills, reported from standing committees without amendment, were read the third time and passed.

Bill (74), "An Act respecting the Manitoba & North Western Railway of Canada." (Mr. Girard).

Bill (61), "An Act further to amend the Acts incorporating the Richelieu Navigation Company, and the Richelieu & Ontario Navigation Company." (Mr. Pelletier).

DOMINION GRANGE FIRE INSURANCE ASSOCIATION'S BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. MR. ALLAN, from the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills, reported Bill (55), "An Act for granting certain powers to the Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Insurance Association, with amendments." He said—This Bill is for the purpose of granting certain powers to the Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Insurance Association, which was incorporated under certain Acts of the province of Ontario, for the purpose specially of insuring the property of members of the Association, known as the Patrons of Husbandry. By this Act they seek to have their power extended to other provinces of the Dominion, and in doing so they wish to have their policies limited to a term of three years. The wording of the Bill as it came to the committee would have the effect of limiting—or we supposed it would have the effect of limiting—them to the powers they possessed under the Act of the province of Ontario. Those words were struck out and it is simply provided that under this Act the Association should only issue policies for three years. That is the only amendment.

HON. MR. PLUMB moved that the amendments be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was then read the third time and passed.

LANDS IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

INQUIRY.

HON. MR. WARK rose to call attention to the arrangement recently entered into by this Government with the Government of Manitoba, and inquire whether the Government intends to set apart and reserve a portion of the lands in the territory purchased from the Hudson Bay Company, in order to apply the funds arising from the sale thereof towards liquidating the debt now being incurred on behalf of said territory? He said: It will be remembered that some years ago it was proposed to set apart 100,000,000 acres of land towards the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not know whether any steps have been taken with regard to that or not, but my attention has been called to the subject recently, in consequence of a return which was laid before Parliament, being an agreement entered into by the Dominion Government with the province of Manitoba, settling all claims up to the present time. Some years ago, I remember seeing that the Provincial Government put forward a claim to all the lands within the province, and I think they have since not only claimed all the lands but the moneys arising from the sales of the lands that have been disposed of. Comparing the position of this province and the new provinces about to be erected in the North-West, so far as regards the endowment of land, it strikes me that the older provinces have very considerable claims on these lands before they begin to be distributed. I do not know that Manitoba is one of the largest provinces. When it was originally erected into a province, it contained only 9,500,000 acres, but it has since been enlarged to ten times that amount. It has now 96,000,000 of acres. Assuming that 6,000,000 of those acres have been granted, which I suppose is an outside estimate, there are still 90,000,000 of acres in that province that are ungranted. The population at

the last census was 65,950. Assuming that it is now 100,000 the expense, as stated in the arrangement made with the Government here, which has been incurred in that province, is put down at $28,650,000. Now, I only look to our own province, so far as regards this expenditure. We have 1/13 of the population of the whole Dominion. I think I may fairly assume that we pay fully 1/13 of all the burdens that fall upon the people of this Dominion. At that rate, we have expended at least $2,000,000 in the province of Manitoba. Now, I think we are entitled to some consideration for this. I am not authorized to speak for the Maritime Provinces generally; but I may remark, *en passant*, that the Maritime Provinces contain 1/5 of the population, and consequently their expenditure, taken altogether, in Manitoba, would be $5,730,000. I am disposed to deal with this young colony, as I think all young colonies ought to be dealt with, in a liberal manner, but at the same time the interests of the older colonies, or provinces, are to be considered, and must not be lost sight of. Before this expenditure in the North-West is ended, I have no doubt, it will reach between $100,000,000 and $150,000,000, and I believe that a very considerable portion of the lands of the Dominion in the North-West ought to be set apart to liquidate this debt, else it will be a very serious burden on us for all time to come. Suppose we set apart 20,000,000 of acres in each province, say in Manitoba, Assiniboia, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Athabaska; that will make it 100,000,000 acres of land, and it will be a very small proportion of the lands contained in these provinces. The people in the North-West claim these lands on the ground that the older provinces were permitted to retain all their lands, but I wish to show to the House what lands New Brunswick has and how it came by these lands. I may observe first, we had only 17,393,000 acres in our province altogether. Of that, now, there is nearly 10,000,000 granted. There is a little over 7,000,000 left. When our province was first established, our first Legislature met in 1786. A number of loyalist families had come to the province and they obtained grants, certainly not extravagant, from the Crown; but from that time those emigrants that came out to that country had to pay for every acre of land that they received. There were no free homesteads or free lands; every man who wanted 100 acres of land had to pay for it. There were no roads or bridges; the immigrants had to make these themselves. The Crown retained the sole control of the lands for fifty years. Although they had a Legislature, it had not the right to sell an acre of these lands, nor even a tree off the land. A commissioner was sent out by the Imperial Government, who had the sole control and management of the lands, and the proceeds arising from them were retained for the payment of the civil list. The Crown kept the control of the whole. Again, when grants were made they reserved the best timber on the land, and they reserved a quit rent. The parties who received the grant were liable to pay a quit rent, and there was a reservation of certain mines and minerals; so that all the right the purchaser had was to cultivate the surface of the soil. This state of things went on for fifty years, and then a good deal of dissatisfaction being felt, especially among the representatives of the people, and two or three delegations having been sent home to treat with the Government on the subject, a bargain was made by which we agreed to take over the whole civil list, the Imperial Government giving us control of the public lands; and I suppose at that time there was not more than eleven or twelve million acres of land left. We had to pay for that, the salaries of the lieut.-governor, his private secretary, the surveyor general and the indoor establishment expenses, the provincial secretary, the chief justice and three puisne judges, the attorney general, the solicitor general, the auditor general and the receiver general. We undertook to pay all these salaries, and the amount which was exacted from us was £14,500, or $58,000. Just about that time, we had established the Court of Chancery, with a salary to the judge of $3,200. He frequently applied to have his salary placed on the civil list, but never succeeded. That sum, added to the bargain made with the Government for the land, whether we received it from the land or not, was a first charge upon our ordinary revenue, and payable quarterly. We, therefore, had $61,200 to pay, and we paid that from the

time this arrangement was entered into in 1837, down to Confederation. In that time we paid $1,836,000, and here is the land we have now left for that heavy charge upon the lands that were transferred to us; so that it will be seen that we paid pretty dearly for all the lands we have. I did not mention that among the sums which were chargeable on the civil list, was £1,000 sterling to endow our university, and that was given on condition of our granting out of the ordinary revenue £1,000 additional to meet it. Both those charges we have still to pay, and justly, too. I may remark, in referring to the university, that that worthy man, King George the Fourth, thought he was exceedingly generous when he endowed our university with 5,950 acres of land, and not of the best quality. I see by the arrangement proposed to be entered into with Manitoba, that the Government propose to give them 150,000 acres, twenty-five times more than the endowment we received.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—And better land.

HON. MR. WARK—And far better land. The Civil-list Act that they passed to secure the Government was very stringent. The money was to be paid quarterly, and we were bound not to sell an acre of the land but what was set up and sold by public auction; and this was a very wholesome regulation. If the Dominion Government ever propose to give control of the lands to the new provinces they cannot do better than follow this example. If we were selling a timber berth it had to be advertised, and sold at public auction, and the lands the same.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—And an upset price fixed.

HON. MR. WARK—Yes, and an upset price fixed, as my hon. friend reminds me. There is another matter I ought to refer to; we had probably 9,000,000 acres of land when we came into Confederation. We had to subsidize a railway which took 1,700,000 acres, nearly three-quarters of our land, small as the portion of lands we possessed was. And I may now remark, *en passant*, seeing the Government have been so liberal to railways, and are endowing railways in the different parts of the Dominion, it would be a graceful act on their part, I might say a generous act, for the Government to buy this land from the company to whom it was granted, and hand it back to our province. I hope the Minister of Justice will note this, and talk it over with his colleagues. Now, if the province of Manitoba, and those other new provinces, get the proceeds of the large portions of land which would be left after the deduction which I have referred to, they would have an income from these lands for a century, or centuries perhaps, after our small income from our lands is exhausted. This may be a very trifling question to the large provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Their revenues from lands will be almost inexhaustible; but it is very different with the Maritime Provinces—very different with us in New Brunswick, and if this heavy debt is to remain as a dead weight upon us while we have no revenues of this kind, it will be almost intolerable; consequently, I feel satisfied that these lands ought to be set apart, and the proceeds of them strictly kept for no other purpose but to reduce the debt.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. WARK—I am satisfied New Brunswick will not have less of this burden to bear than $8,000,000 or $10,000,000. It will not come on us directly, but it will come indirectly, and we ought to consider it, and try to get quit of this part of the public debt in order to enable us to get along more comfortably with that portion of the debt which we must bear. We came into Confederation with a small debt. We increased it a little by what is considered a part of the contract. We had our share of the expenses in constructing the railway. We did not object then in the Maritime Province to the deepening of the canals, but when we got that far we thought we would stop and try to pay all our debts instead of incurring more. There is the debt to the Hudson Bay Company. There is the expense of this enormous undertaking, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the expense of keeping up the North-West Mounted Police. For all those things, the lands ought to

contribute the principal part of the expenses. I need not take up further the time of the House, but would just ask the question of which I gave notice.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—The scheme which my hon. friend proposes has not been considered by the Government. We had no intention of setting apart any particular lands, because the proceeds of the sales of all the lands were going into a common purse, and any contribution to Manitoba is paid out of that common purse; but the idea suggested by the hon. gentleman is—and I understand it now for the first time—that to take those moneys out of the common purse is, to some extent, unfair to the smaller provinces. I think that is the point he makes. I will take care to bring it under the notice of the Premier and my colleagues, and, perhaps, will take occasion hereafter to refer to the subject again; but the answer to the hon. gentleman's question, in the meantime, is that we have not deemed it necessary, so far, to take such steps as he suggests, because all the proceeds of the lands sold go into a common purse, out of which the payments to Manitoba come.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—If I understand the object of the hon. gentleman's motion, it is this: the Federal Government have made collossal expenditures to accomplish the development of our North-West Territory, probably amounting to ninety or one hundred millions of dollars, and they have thereby increased the public burdens of the older provinces. We remember very well after Confederation, and upon our entering upon these very large expenditures for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the solemn pledge or statement made by the first Minister and other members of the Government, that the whole amount thus expended would be recouped from the sale of the public lands, and my hon. friend from Fredericton is perfectly correct; he takes a tenable position when speaking on behalf of his province; he says that the province of New Brunswick have a perfect right to demand that that solemn pledge or assurance should be faithfully carried out by the Government of the day. If I understand his view, as expressed, he demands that the Government should set apart 100,000,000 of acres in the North-West, to which the Minister of Justice has replied (if I heard him correctly) that nothing has yet been done in that direction. The proposition is that the proceeds of the sales of these lands should be kept as a special or sinking fund to carry out that solemn assurance given by the Government to the people of the older provinces. I do not suppose that my hon. friend who has brought this matter before us has the very slightest hope that the present Government will make any effort to fulfil that pledge.

HON. MR. WARK—Oh, yes.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Knowing their ways, knowing as I do their record for the last four years in the management of public affairs, it is a hope which I do not entertain. The hon. gentleman will remember that for some time Parliament has really and truly, as it were, surrendered its judgment to the First Minister upon such leading public questions. The Parliament of the country has not been directing the public expenditures, but a large majority of the House of Commons and a very large majority of this august body, worshipping the First Minister as never any idol was worshipped in Assyria or ancient Greece, placing such entire faith in his prudence and astuteness, have surrendered their judgment and allowed him to take his own course, thinking he would act with wisdom and care, and that everything he would do would be wisely and properly done. That is the position, and I defy any member of this House to gainsay that position—that the Parliament have not tried to control and guide the First Minister, and we now see the result. Parliament, composed as it is of the first minds of the country, has ceased to control and check the executive government.

HON. MR. DEVER—He is the leader of the expedition—old Agamemnon.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—The First Minister is a most extraordinary man. The country has never produced, and may never again produce, his equal for astuteness, but what about the means he adopts—his Gerrymandering Bills, and

his Franchise Bills, brought in to control Parliament, which the rules of Parliament will not allow me to characterize as they ought to be characterized? I think the country now begins to feel, and I mistake very greatly if the Parliament of the country does not now feel, that their faith has been misplaced; and if they do not feel it now, I am sure they must feel it before six months have passed. Whether from age or other causes, the First Minister is no longer a reliable leader, especially in questions of finance. He is an astute lawyer and parliamentarian; he knows how to manipulate men, but has become latterly a danger in the state, and the country will reap a most bitter experience from the fact of its Parliament having surrendered their judgment and left him to guide public affairs. It is becoming daily more evident. He knows nothing about finance, either in the management of his own affairs or the affairs of the country. We see that singular dispensation often in distinguished lawyers. God does not give every talent to one man; he gives to one man one talent and to another another. I am surprised that the members of both branches of the Legislature are not alarmed at the manner in which the First Minister has brought the country liable for those enormous expenditures in the far North-West and through the Alpine range of the Rocky Mountains, contrary to the common sense of every commercial man in the country. It is no wonder that my hon. friend from New Brunswick is moving in this direction, speaking on behalf of the Maritime Provinces, when he finds that from $70,000,000 to $100,000,000 have been sunk in such a manner with so little prospect of its conferring any substantial benefit on the people for a long time to come. The First Minister takes no advice; he has not even consulted the Parliament. He has got this Pacific Railway on the brain, and we will in a very short time see the financial obligations that he will have imposed on the country, and if he succeeds through this Franchise Bill to defeat again the opposite party, his reckless and wild expenditures may break up the Confederation. The provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, like Quebec and Ontario, peopled by an industrious, and upright population, will then feel deeply incensed that Parliament should have trusted to one mind the destinies of the country. By culpable neglect, they have brought upon us the calamity of sedition and civil war, and if they remain much longer in power, will bring on serious commercial disaster.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I rise, after having listened to this address, with some hesitation. In the first place, I am surprised that my hon. friend from Woodstock has become the champion of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Almost the first address that I had the honour of listening to in this House from that hon. gentleman was one in which he denounced the Administration of the day for building the Intercolonial Railway. The spirit breathed throughout that speech was that it would be better to let the Maritime Provinces go, because they were robbing Ontario. I remember it vividly. He rolled off columns of figures like a boy's multiplication table, showing the expense of this herculean work, as he called it, the Intercolonial Railway. No words could be found to express his utter condemnation of the Government for building that great highway; no words could be found to express the holy horror which he entertained of the people of the Maritime Provinces. I do not say this from memory merely; I speak after having recently read the report of his speech on that subject. It struck me at the time as coming with very bad grace from a member supporting the Administration of the day. In my ignorance of this hon. body, I thought if that was the spirit which animated the members from the Upper Provinces, it was a mistake that the Maritime Provinces had entered the Confederation. After an experience of twelve or thirteen years in this Chamber, I know that these were not the opinions of the people of Ontario and Quebec, and to-day I congratulate the hon. gentleman that he no longer pours out his vials of wrath on the Administration for having constructed the Intercolonial Railway. At that time his attacks were not confined to one session of Parliament, but every session we had the annual diatribe against the Government for having built the Intercolonial Railway. I congratulate the hon. member that a few years of experience

in the public affairs of the Dominion has so far disproved his judgment that he now becomes the champion of the Maritime Provinces. This session, we have been called upon to listen to the hon. member attacking the members of the Government in this House, and those who support them, until forbearance has been pushed to its utmost limits. He has told us to-day that every man in this Chamber who sustains the Government of the day is simply a tool in the hands of the Premier. He must have been pretty well sharpened himself during the time he was on the Government grindstone; he tells us that it is only for the last four years that the Government has gone wrong in its policy. Ever since he has held a seat in Parliament—I take it from his own words—he has always been a Conservative, and always supported Sir John Macdonald and his policy.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER — Hear, hear.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—The hon. gentleman himself acknowledges the fact; still, after a long experience in parliamentary life, speaking with a knowledge of public affairs which every one must admire, he is from day to day blotting out the record of his mature manhood, and now at advanced age he is giving the lie to the experience of his past life. It is pleasant for us to hear discussions which arise on public affairs, and the hon. member has had my sympathy in trying to get his views before the people on public questions, but that sympathy has been exhausted when he tells me that for twelve or thirteen years during which I have held a seat in this Chamber, I have been only a tool in the hands of the Premier, and yet my votes have always been recorded side by side with those of the hon. gentleman.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—No, no.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I say every vote has been given side by side with his, and it is time that the members of this House should assert themselves and let the hon. member know that there are Senators with as lofty an idea of national faith and honor, and possessed of as patriotic motives as the hon. gentleman himself. Charity has been extended to him until at last he has assumed to grossly insult every member of the Senate who supports the Government of the day. He tells us that no one has acted from experience, judgment or patriotic motives but himself. He carries the whole patriotism and wisdom of the Senate upon his shoulders. I can only say, God help the wisdom and patriotism of this House if he is the receptacle of it. When he speaks of expenditure on the Pacific Railway, surely his memory must be at fault. From the inception of the resolutions in this Chamber, and in every division, from the inauguration of the railway until recently, his vote will be found, and not only his vote but his speeches, recorded in favor of that great enterprise. You will find that he has held up to the admiration of the public the lofty plan—I think those are the words he used—by which the administration takes hold of this question and purposes to bring it to its proper issue. The records of the House show that at every stage in the progress of the enterprise his vote has been recorded in its favor.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Not to rush it through in 1885.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—The records are there for anyone to satisfy himself on that point. For some reason, justifiable or unjustifiable, it is not my place to inquire which—for some petty quarrel with two or three members of this House—

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—The hon. gentleman is not in order. He is introducing matters not relevant to the subject, contrary to the rules of Parliament. He has no right to impute motives.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—The hon. member has himself imputed motives.

THE SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman from Alberton is certainly out of order, in attributing motives to the hon. member.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I bow to the decision of the Chair, but I ask the House is it not time to resent these insults which have been heaped upon us by the hon.

member from Woodstock? I, for one, will no longer permit him to assert that I am a mere registering machine without an idea or opinion of my own. It is time that a stop should be put to such language, and I can only say that so far as I am concerned, it shall end.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—When I rose just now to speak, it was with the same impulse as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. When the hon. member from Woodstock rises to address this House, he plays the role of Bombastes Furioso—or rather he flits about like some *ignis fatuus*. He does no harm, but he always drifts away from the subject before the House, showing that his desire is, not to bring his knowledge or experience to the question before the Senate, but simply to make an attack on the members of the Governmunt in this House. I rose with the object of expressing my indignation at the style of the hon. member's remarks. I shall say nothing more on that matter, but, reverting to the subject brought before us by the hon. member from Fredericton, I concur in his opinion, that the Maritime Provinces feel that the lands of the North-West should recoup us largely for the money that has been expended in the development of that great country. We paid a large sum to acquire the North-West Territories; we have incurred heavy obligations in establishing communication with that country, and extinguishing the Indian title, and we are obliged to expend large sums annually to feed and take care of the Indian tribes, and to settle the North-West. We have assumed serious responsibilities, and we should be recouped to a large extent for our enormous outlays, by the sales of lands there. However, I do not agree with my hon. friend, that we should lock up any portion of these lands for that purpose. We might obstruct settlement, and check the opening up of railway communication. The moneys derived from the sales of lands, go into the public treasury, and are applied, as far as they go, to meet the expenditures of the country. I believe that, in the course of time, the lands in the North-West will repay us a large portion of the money we have expended in opening up that country, but I am not in favor of setting apart a large portion of the public domain for the purpose of reccuping us for our outlay.

HON. MR. POWER—I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg in the way he has characterized the hon. member from Woodstock. He spoke of him as an *ignis fatuus*. Now, an *ignis fatuus* is something that keeps moving about and dancing in front of one. If there is anything which peculiarly characterizes the hon. member from Woodstock, at any rate during the present session, it is that one always knows where he is on every question. Instead of changing frequently and being hard to locate, he is extremely easy to locate.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It is a good idea though—a false light.

HON. MR. POWER—Still it is a steady light; we know where he is always. The line of argument adopted by the hon. member from Alberton is certainly not a very forcible one, and not one that is likely to convince. He seems to think that the hon. member from Woodstock is to be reprobated, because, having supported the Conservative party, and the present leader of that party for several years, he is at last obliged to desert him.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I said nothing at all of the kind.

HON. MR. POWER—Possibly my hearing is bad, but I understood the hon. gentleman to express his astonishment at the inconsistency of a life-long Conservative—

HON. MR. HOWLAN—No, no.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman expressed his astonishment that a life-long Conservative should speak in the way he does about the Government and about those who support the Government. I think there is another way to look at that: I can quite understand that a gentleman in whom the feeling of party loyalty is strong, can stand a good deal; that the Government can go on doing things that may not meet with his approval, and his party feeling is so strong that he forbears to speak or vote against the Government; but, as in the case of artillery, there is a

bursting charge, and at last the iniquities of the Government had reached the point where the strain was so great, that the party allegiance of the hon. gentleman from Woodstock could stand it no longer. I think the fact that the hon. gentleman from Woodstock, who has acted in harmony with the Conservative party and its leaders for nearly a life time, towards the end of that life, when he has nothing to gain by a change, changed his mind, and that he no longer follows the leader of the Conservative party, is the very strongest evidence that the leader of the Conservative party has gone astray.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—You will not take him into your party.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman has not asked to come into our party; he says he is an independent Conservative; but, although the hon. gentleman does not belong to the Liberal party, I feel the fact that he stands alone is an additional reason why he should have fair play, and while standing alone that he should receive some consideration. Even if it is a fact that the hon. gentleman from Woodstock has changed his views on important subjects, I hardly think that the hon. gentleman from Alberton is in the best position in the House to reproach any member for doing it. The hon. gentleman from Alberton has changed his mind on most important public questions on more than one occasion; and I do not think, therefore, that he should be so ready to blame other people for doing what he has done himself.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I rise to a point of order. What I blamed my hon. friend from Woodstock for, was not for having changed his opinion, but for insulting every member of this House, by saying that we were tools of the Government—a mere registering body.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I never used such language! I never applied such language! Never!

HON. MR. POWER—I am not going to defend the hon. gentleman from Woodstock or his language, because I think that on several occasions that hon. gentleman's language with respect to certain members of this House has been altogether indefensible; but I think that, as a rule, the hon. member has guarded himself from saying anything offensive which applied to the whole House, or a majority of the House.

HON. MR. ALLAN—Only to five.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—Not to the Opposition, certainly he does not; but to the Conservative side of the House he does.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not remember that the hon. gentleman from Woodstock has used unparliamentary language as regards the majority of the House; he has certainly used unparliamentary language with reference to certain members of it.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I merely accuse the majority of the members of the House of idol-worship—worship of the First Minister.

HON. MR. POWER—This session is very likely to show whether or not—if the hon. member from Woodstock has stated hat the majority of this House are idol-worshippers—the hon. gentleman is right or not. As to the question put by the hon. member from Fredericton, I wish to say that I, in the main, concur with him. I think that just as sinking funds are set aside for certain purposes, it would probably be a wise course to set aside the proceeds of the sale of those lands in the North-West for the specific purpose of paying for the expenditure which has taken place in connection with the North-West. We have been told a great many times that those lands would pay for the constructing of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and would pay also for all the other expenses incurred in connection with the acquisition and settlement of that country; and it would be a wise, and it seems to me a statesmanlike, course to follow the advice of my hon. friend from Fredericton.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It always gives me pleasure, and I think it does also the other members of this House, to hear my

hon. friend from Fredericton address this Chamber. He always speaks in a statesmanlike manner, and only when he has something important to bring forward. The proposition which he makes is one that could hardly be carried out. I do not think that it is at all desirable to tie up the lands in the North-West for any special purpose; we have to trust the Government of the day with the proper administration of that fund, and with applying it where it should be applied, that is, to recoup the Government for the expenditures that have been made for the opening up and improvement of the North-West. I did not quite understand my hon. friend in the statement which he made, with respect to the expenditures in the North-West. When I was in the other House, I requested that a separate account should be made up and attached to the public accounts, showing the exact amount that was expended in the North-West, and I find that that account is here. Out of an expenditure of $50,000,000 for the North-West, $29,559,000 has been expended upon the Pacific Railway, and $6,000,000 for the Indians. Against that total expenditure of $50,000,000, there have been receipts amounting to $11,214,000, leaving a balance of nearly $39,000,000. But the total expenditure, less the sums paid out of the consolidated fund, is $16,320,000. I have, myself, faith that the time will come when those expenditures will be largely recouped by the sale of the lands in the North-West; but if the course which has been pursued in referring to the condition of the North-West, and the administration of the affairs of the North-West, is continued by the Opposition and by the Opposition press, it is evident that that day will be postponed..

HON MR. POWER—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. PLUMB—There is no question about it at all. There has been a constant endeavor to injure the North-West, and to retard the settlement of that country. I am very sorry to say that it is patent to every one, and if we have failed so far to realize the expectations that were held out, it is due very largely to the position taken by the Reform party in this country.

HON. MR. POWER—A good joke.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It is a good deal more than a joke. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman who made that harangue—I think that is a parliamentary word—after the leader of this House had spoken, is not present. I concur entirely with my hon. friend who sits at my right hand that this House has extended towards he hon. member from Woodstock a kind of indulgence which he has shown, from time to time, that he has not deserved. I for one have listened with astonishment to the tirades which he has addressed to this House. I have heard him charge hon. members with a kind of iniquity, which, but for consideration of his peculiar condition of mind, could not have been passed over either by the members of this House generally, or by the gentlemen who were particularly referred to. I congratulate, however, the senior member for Halifax on having taken that hon. gentleman under his protection. I can congratulate him upon the accession to his leadership of that hon. gentleman who, having formally deposed the regular leader of the Opposition, has so far placed himself under the leadership of the hon. gentleman from Halifax.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It must be a great satisfaction to himself to have the hon. gentleman from Woodstock as an ally, and to accept that hon. gentleman's judgment on public affairs; but he is quite welcome to whatever satisfaction it may give him. The hon. member from Halifax rises in defence of his erratic follower on almost all occasions, actuated, as I can see, by a feeling of secret gratitude. The hon. gentleman from Woodstock has not hesitated to assert that the hon. gentleman who has for a long time led the Opposition in this House, and who holds the respect, I think, of both sides, has failed to fulfil his mission; that he is a "political fraud"—that is the expression that has been used—and he has utterly repudiated and deposed the hon. gentleman from Ottawa, and has placed my hon. friend from Halifax in a position which, out of gratitude, compels him to acknowledge the hon. gentleman from

Woodstock on all occasions, and stand up in his defence. I think we have tolerated this farce long enough, and this House ought to feel indebted to my hon. friend from Alberton for the manly indignation he has expressed at the insults that have been heaped on this House in calling us mere tools to register the decrees of one man. I think that this House can assert its independence on any occasion, and its honor and dignity do not rest with the hon. gentleman from Woodstock, who, I see, has absented himself. He has done more towards lowering and degrading the position of this House than any gentleman who has been connected with it since I have had the honor of a seat in the Senate of Canada.

HON. MR. DICKEY—It is one of the inconveniences attendant upon a question being submitted to the House, under a notice such as we are at present discussing, that members are apt to be diverted to side issues. I may say in rising that I am not prepared to follow them into those issues, because I think it is scarcely fair to my hon. friend who has presented this matter to the House that his question, which is a grave one, and the subject which he has brought before the House is equally grave, should be met in the way it has been met. I think he has done his province good service in submitting this matter to Parliament. I may add that so far as the province from which I come is concerned, we stand very much in the same position. Some fifty years ago the question of the public lands and the civil list was settled very much upon the same lines as those which he has stated to the House as regarding New Brunswick, and we feel naturally a sympathy for the position he has taken, and for the course that he recommends in this matter. I do not know that the present moment is a time to discuss it, because the question has been met in such a way by the leader of the Government in this House, that it rather prevents hon. members from taking a line antagonistic to the Government. The hon. member has submitted his case in such a clear and courteous way to the attention of the Government that he has succeeded in eliciting from the leader of the House a pledge that this matter will be taken into consideration. Under those circumstances, I do not think it would be wise to discuss the question at large. I only rise for the purpose of expressing my own sympathy with the course taken by the hon. gentleman from Fredericton, and with the views that he has expressed. Under the circumstances he has succeeded in the object that he presented to himself, and in eliciting from the Government a promise that the question should be looked into. It is a very large subject, and it would not be, I think, an opportune moment to discuss it any further. I hope that the pledge which has been given to my hon. friend will be redeemed in due season, and that this whole question of the position in which the Maritime Provinces stand with regard to the enormous expenditure of the North-West shall be gravely considered by the Government. Under those circumstances, I do not think it necessary to add anything to what has been said by my hon. friend, because the facts are so plain and so clear, and so written upon the page of the history of the Dominion, that they cannot be mistaken. I think my hon. friend deserves credit not only for bringing the matter up, but for the manner in which he has brought it up, as he has done so in a way that will present it most favorably to the Government.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I might add a few words by way of endorsing the remark of the hon. gentleman from Amherst. I think that the hon. member from Fredericton has done very good service, so far as his own province and the Maritime Provinces generally are concerned, in bringing this question before the House and presenting it in a phase which to many of us is new. I must confess, not having the long years of experience of my hon. friend, that I was not so well acquainted with the early history of the affairs connected with my own province as my hon. friend appears to be, and he has detailed very clearly and very fully the position which New Brunswick occupied in relation to our public lands, and the position financially in which that province stands with regard to Manitoba and the North-West; and he has also intimated very plainly the inequality of taxation under which certain provinces labor in the opening up and developing

of that country. It must be apparent to every one, considering the immense amount of money that has been expended on the Pacific Railway, that some of us may have been under the impression that it was being built mainly in consequence of the terms made with British Columbia, but I see in the minute of council which has been placed on our desks, that in the correspondence regarding Manitoba's claims, the Government set forth that, so far as British Columbia is concerned, a waggon road might have been sufficient—or, at least, they would have adhered to that proposition were it not that it was necessary to open up the lands of Manitoba and the North-West to settlement; consequently the interest which Manitoba has in that, should be taken into account in making adjustment. Something has been said with reference to the Intercolonial Railway. Of course, a large expenditure has been made in the lower provinces in the construction of that road, yet it is perfectly well known by gentlemen in this House that one of the strong reasons why that road was built in the peculiar location in which it is, was on account of certain Imperial interests, and that therefore the benefit which we might have derived from the carrying out of that original scheme has been greatly neutralized, and the road has not been found to be a commercial road in the interests of New Brunswick. I may say that I am very glad indeed that the hon. gentleman from Fredericton has brought up this question, and has shown the very great inequality that exists in the taxation of the different provinces, and the necessity for some proper, just, and equitable arrangement which will adequately meet the sound and mature judgment of the people of the lower provinces.

HON. MR. SUTHERLAND—I did not intend to say a word on this question, and have not by any means prepared myself to do so, but there are one or two points that I wish to refer to. It is generally supposed—at all events by a great many people—that the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway is, as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has said, principally in the interests of Manitoba and the North-West. Of course, there is no doubt that we have derived the first benefit from the building of the railway, but the great expenditure that has been made has not been incurred on account of Manitoba. The whole of the money that has been credited to Manitoba and the North-West has not been expended there; a large proportion of it has been expended in British Columbia and in Ontario, yet we are saddled with those expenditures in the North-West and Manitoba. I do not think that is fair. Another point that I wish merely to touch upon is, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down wishes to show the inequality in taxation between Manitoba and the North-West and New Brunswick. I would not be very positive about the exact figures, but the last time that I had occasion to find out the amounts paid to the revenue by the two provinces, it was something like three dollars a head for New Brunswick, and about eleven dollars per head for Manitoba and the North-West. These are the points that I wish to mention just now, but if the matter comes up again I shall be prepared to make these statements and some others more fully than I can now.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE BILL.

THIRD READING.

Bill (T), "An Act respecting the North-West Mounted Police," was reported from Committee of the Whole without amendment: read the third time and passed without debate.

The Senate adjourned at 4.45 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Wednesday, May 6th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

A PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE rose to give notice that he would move that when this

House adjourns on Friday next, it stand adjourned until Wednesday the 20th inst. He said: It is well known that this House has almost completed the work before it now. We have to wait for an important measure which is before the other House for some time, and there can be no objection to the adjournment for a few days.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AND LIQUOR LICENSE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The order of the day having been called,

Committee of the Whole House on (Bill 92), "The Canada Temperance Act 1878, and The Liquor License Act 1883, further Amendment Bill,"

HON MR. POWER moved,

That it be an instruction to the said Committee to insert a provision in the said Bill requiring that whenever in future a poll is taken under "The Canada Temperance Act 1878," the Petition shall not be held to have been adopted unless more than three-fifths of the votes polled are for the Petition.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Before the hon. gentleman proceeds I should like to raise a question of order with reference to this proposed motion. I find in Bourinot, that it is not regular to instruct a committee to entertain a question that is outside of the Bill which is before them. I object that this motion is outside of the Bill which is now before us. The Bill does not touch on the question of voting, and this amendment relates to the majority by which a petition shall be carried. I find also that an instruction to a committee is not mandatory, and therefore it is necessary to state explicitly in the motion that the committee have power to make the change. The motion is mandatory; it is an instruction to the committee to insert an amendment. For the first point I refer to page 536, Bourinot, and for the second I refer to page 537.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not think the hon. gentleman's point is well taken. In the first place, his idea as to instructions is so far astray that it would not be regular to move an instruction in the way he says. If the amendment is one which can be made in Committee of the Whole, it is not a subject matter for an instruction, and it is just because I thought that this requirement that at least three-fifths of the persons voting should be in favor of the petition before the petition would be deemed to be carried—just because I thought that that could not be done in a Committee of the Whole, that I proposed to move an instruction. The whole matter of instructions is dealt with at considerable length and very clearly in Bourinot. The subject begins at page 533 and continues down to page 538. I shall just read a few lines to show my hon. friend that he has mistaken the point.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I have read the lines that the hon gentleman refers to.

HON. MR. POWER—The House has not heard them. Bourinot says—

"An 'instruction,' empowering a committee to make those changes in a bill which otherwise it could not make, should be moved as soon as the order for the committee has been read by the clerk, and before the question is put that the Speaker do leave the chair. An instruction, properly speaking, is not of the nature of an amendment, but of a substantive motion which ought to have precedence of the question that the Speaker do leave the chair. If an instruction is moved when the latter motion is proposed, then it becomes an amendment, which, if agreed to, supercedes the motion for the committee, and the Bill consequently cannot be proceeded with for the time being.

Considerable misapprehension appears to exist among some members of the Canadian Commons as to the meaning of an instruction—a misapprehension by no means confined to that body, since English speakers have frequently found it necessary to give decisions and explanations on the subject. An instruction, according to these decisions, is given to a committee to confer on it that power which, without such instruction, it would not have. If the subject-matter of an instruction is relevant to the subject-matter, and within the scope and titles of a bill, then such instruction is irregular since the committee has the power to make the required amendment. The following precedents will illustrate the correct practice with respect to this class of motion:

"In 1854, the English Commons had before them a 'Bill to abolish in England and Wales the compulsory removal of the poor on the ground of settlement,' and a member proposed to introduce clauses into the Bill to prevent

the removal of Irish paupers in the different unions of the country. It was pointed out that the contemplated changes would entirely alter the character of the Bill, and could only be made by an instruction; the Speaker, being appealed to, said that the rule had been clearly stated, and if the noble lord intended to propose the addition of the new provisions alluded to, it would be necessary to move them as an instruction to the committee.

"In 1865, the order for committee on the Union Chargeability Bill having been read, Mr. Bentinck moved that, 'it be an instruction to the committee, with a view to render the working of the system of union chargeability more just and equal; that they have power to facilitate, in certain cases, the alteration of the limits of existing unions.' An objection was at once taken, that under the Poor Law Board Act there was power to alter the boundary of unions, and therefore an instruction was not necessary. The Speaker (Mr. Dennison) decided: 'The question is not as to whether the Poor Law Board has the power, but whether the committee would have it without the instruction; and, in my opinion, the committee would not have that power, because the subject matter would not be relevant to the subject matter in the Bill. Therefore the motion is in order, and should have precedence, because an instruction is not of the nature of an amendment, but of a substantive motion.

"In 1878, the order for committee on the Factories and Workshops Bill having been read, Mr. Fawcett rose to move an instruction extending the operation of the Bill to children employed in agriculture. Mr. Speaker Brand stated in reply to an objection to the proceeding: 'The motion of the hon. member is in the form of an instruction to the committee. The committee would not have power to deal with the question unless an instruction of this House were passed."

And there are other cases given which go to show what is the exact nature of an instruction. Now, I proceeded in the way I have done because I felt that objection might be justly taken to an amendment of this kind that it did not come within the purview of the Bill which is now before the House. I know that is a matter as to which opinions differ. Some hon. gentlemen think that we could in committee have amended the Bill before the House in the direction in which I wish to see it amended. My own opinion was different. I thought that we had not the whole of the Canada Temperance Act before us, and that consequently this amendment could not have been moved in committee. I consulted this work on the subject and I thought that the course which I have adopted was the correct one, but in order to be quite clear about it, I consulted the author of the work, Mr. Bourinot, on the subject, and he told me that the course which I have taken was the proper one to take. Fortified by his opinion, I put the notice on the paper in the form in which it appears. I do not think it is necessary to read any further authority; I think it is clear enough.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—I cannot agree with the hon. member from Halifax that what he has read at all sustains the position which he takes. I think it is quite clear that the amendment which he proposes, giving instructions to a Committee of the Whole, is one which can be made without instructions by the Committee of the Whole to which the Bill is to be referred. The authorities show clearly that if the Committee of the Whole have authority to deal with the amendment, then the instruction is out of order, and the authorities which the hon. member has read show as clearly as possible that it is only in cases where the subject of the instruction is not within the power of the Committee of the Whole, that instruction can be given. If the Committee of the Whole have, by their functions, power to deal with the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member, then under the authorities quoted, it is quite clear that he is out of order in moving an instruction to the committee on a question with which they have power to deal. It will be recollected that last year, when this Bill came up, and the hon. member from Amherst moved an amendment at the third reading similar to the one which the hon. member from Halifax is now seeking to move, objection was taken to it that it was out of order, and the honorable the Speaker clearly decided that the amendment was in order — that it was an amendment to the Bill which was consistent with the provisions of the Bill, and that the hon. member from Amherst was in order in moving it at the third reading. I take this ground that if the hon. member from Amherst was in order in moving that amendment without notice, that the committee have authority, when the bill is referred to them, to make a similar amendment if the majority of the committee so see fit. I think the point is clear that the com-

mittee have authority to deal with it. The amendment is not at all extraneous to the bill. It is not like the authorities who are referred to in Bourinot in any way. There the amendment referred to a different matter. The bill was to abolish in England and Wales the compulsory removal of the poor on the ground of settlement, and a member proposed to introduce clauses into the bill to prevent the removal of Irish paupers in the different unions of the country. The Speaker's decision in that case was that the committee of the whole had not power to deal with the bill in that line, but that it was necessary to give instruction. There is nothing incongruous between the amendment and the provisions of the bill, and therefore I raise the point of order, not exactly on the point stated by the hon. member from Sarnia, but on the principle that this is an amendment which could be dealt with by the Committee of the Whole, and that the hon. gentleman cannot move the resolution.

HON. MR. POWER—There are two or three cases which follow the quotation which I gave, and which I think may perhaps convince the hon. member from Sackville that this resolution is in order. They will be found at page 535 Bourinot. They are as follows :

"In 1881, the order for the Committee of the Whole on a Bill respecting the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday, in Wales, having been read, it was moved as an instruction that, they have power to extend the same to Monmouthshire"

That was held to be in order. Then again :

"In 1868, the Speaker ruled that a Select Committee to which had been referred the Sale of Liquors on Sunday Bill would be confined to its subject matter, and could not consider the question of the general licensing system without a special instruction from the House.

Now, that was a case very like the one which is before us. In another case, Speaker Denison (page 536 Bourinot) said : "The necessity for an instruction arose from the Acts relating to spirits being considered quite a distinct class ; and to deal with beer, cider and wine would be to deal with separate trades."

The impression made on my mind by these authorities is, that this is a case for an instruction—a case where the instruction is the proper means of making the desired amendment.

THE SPEAKER—The course pursued by the hon. member from Halifax, if the instruction were in order, is perfectly correct. This is the proper time to make the motion placed by the hon. member on the minutes. The motion of which the hon. Senator has given notice is as follows :—

That when the Order of the Day to commit the Bill intituled: "An Act further to amend 'The Canada Temperance Act 1878,' and 'The Liquor License Act 1883,'" to a Committee of the Whole House is read, he will move that it be an instruction to the said Committee to insert a provision in the said Bill requiring that whenever in future a poll is taken under "The Canada Temperance Act 1878," the Petition shall not be held to have been adopted unless more than three-fifths of the votes polled are for the Petition.

The hon. Senator from Sarnia has raised the question on this motion that it is not in order, because it is not germane to the Bill before the Senate. The hon. gentleman quoted from the rules of the House of Commons in support of his contention, but if the hon. member had quoted the whole of the rule he would have found the present motion did not come within it. (The Speaker then read the full rule cited by the Senator from Sarnia). I, therefore, do not think the hon. gentleman from Sarnia was right in the point of order raised by him.

The question of order raised by the hon. Senator from Sackville, (Mr. Botsford) is of a different character, and must, I think, prevail. An instruction to a committee is a power from the House to do something which it cannot do without such authorization. It is not in order to instruct a committee to do anything it has already the power to do. Last year, a motion was made in this House relating to the subject of the present motion, and I then decided that the subject matter was germane to the Bill then before the House, and if it is so, it certainly is quite within the competency of the committee now to deal with it without an instruction. (The Speaker here quoted numerous precedents in support of his views of the case).

My decision is, that the motion of the hon. member from Halifax is not in order.

HON. MR. VIDAL moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole.

In the committee,

HON. MR. VIDAL moved the adoption of the first section of the Bill, providing that it shall he sufficient to deposit the petitions for purposes of inspection, in one registry office in a county where there may happen to be more than one office.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not see any objection to that clause. The difficulty has arisen in one case in the County of Perth, where there are two registry offices, and I believe in other counties where there are more than one registry office also. I do not object to that clause, nor do I think there is any reasonable ground for objecting to the afterpart of the clause, although at first sight it appears to be more objectionable than the first part. It is to legalize what has been done in the past in that respect, but I suppose it is only intended to legal ize it in those cases where the Act has actually gone into force; therefore, I do not think the House need object to the passage of the whole of that clause.

The clause was agreed to.

HON. MR. VIDAL—In moving the adoption of the second clause, the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from British Columbia will be taken into consideration. I am quite prepared to allow him to make his motion at once in amendment to my motion to adopt the second clause of the Bill. I quite agree with the amendments which my hon. friend proposes. I think they are quite in harmony with the spirit of the Bill, and are necessary to make the measure workable in British Columbia.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B.C.)—The reason why I gave notice to have this section amended is this: We have five electoral districts in British Columbia for the House of Commons; we have no cities alone returning members for the House of Commons, and the three cities that we have, unfortunately are not as populous as most of the eastern cities. Victoria, with only a population of some 8,000 or 10,000, returns, with a small portion of the surrounding country, two members to the House of Commons. The same thing applies in New Westminster, district and city; they return only one member for the House of Commons of Canada, and I claim that if the Act is carried in the district that it will be inoperative, and I think that it would be very much better if the words of the section "except city" in the 10th line of the clause were expunged; it would be in the interest of temperance and the cause which the advocates of this Bill have in view. I, therefore, move that the words "except city" in the 10th line in the second clause be expunged.

HON. MR. NELSON—Before the amendment is made, I rise to say that I am entirely opposed to it. That amendment to this Bill was made, I believe, at the suggestion of one of the members of the House of Commons from British Columbia. The amendment was supported by every representative in the Commons from British Columbia, and was passed through that body. The object which I think my hon. friend has in view is perhaps to apply that more especially to the district from which he comes, the district of New Westminister, so as to include the city of New Westminster in the event of the Act being adopted there. The district of New Westminster lies along the American border, from the Gulf of Georgia up to where it touches the district again some 25 or 30 miles. The country there is a wild country, and in the immediate neighborhood of that line on the other side there is a number of small American towns, and it would be impossible to prevent the introduction of liquor from those American towns into New Westminster, and the effect of applying the Scott Act in this manner to the districts, would be to encourage the illicit sale of liquor. There is scarcely a public house to-day in that district. The liquor that is consumed in that portion of the country is carried from the town of New Westminster, and probably a portion of it is smuggled in from the United States.

If the Scott Act were applied to the town of New Westminster, the fact of the matter would be that wholesale smuggling would be carried on across the border from the United States into our district. We have also to take into account the fact that above the district of New Westminster lie the district of Yale and the town of Yale, and there is as much communication between that town and New Westminster, as between New Westminster and its own district, and liquor would be carried down from there and distributed in New Westminster to as great an extent as at present, and the whole effect of applying the Scott Act to the town of New Westminster would be to encourage the smuggling of liquor across the border, to destroy the trade of New Westminster, and to deprive the Dominion of its revenue. For this reason I oppose the amendment.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The effect of the amendment is, really, to make the vote of the electoral district as it stands now. The way in which it is worded, as the Bill is before you, it would make a distinction between the city and surrounding country that does not already exist.

HON. MR. NELSON—That is as far as the House of Commons is concerned, but we have the electoral district of Westminster and the electoral district of New Westminster clearly defined as far as local elections are concerned.

HON. MR. VIDAL—We are not dealing with the divisions into which provinces may divide their counties or districts. We are dealing with the electoral divisions of the House of Commons, and I think the amendment of my hon. friend from New Westminster would be an improvement to the Bill.

HON. MR. MACDONALD — I think the committee would be acting wisely to leave the divisions as put in by the House of Commons. The members of that body settled it in the way it stands, and I think it would be better to leave it as they passed it.

HON MR. MCINNES—I am sorry I stand alone on this question, and that I cannot agree with my hon. colleagues from British Columbia. The hon. gentleman says that if we expunge the words "except city," from this clause, the effect will be to encourage smuggling from the United States and Yale district. I do not believe that such would be the case. If the Scott Act is carried in New Westminster, any smuggling that will take place will be from Victoria. Liquors may be shipped in from there, and sold without the sanction of law. New Westminster is nearly in the centre of the district of Westminster for electoral purposes. If the amendment I propose is not accepted, the Act would be a complete failure there, and I would rather ten times not see it carried in the surrounding country if not carried in the city as well. The Act must be carried in the city as well as the district, or it would be a complete failure, and I can see no good reason why the electoral districts of the House of Commons should not be the standard for electoral districts for the purposes of this Act.

HON. MR. NELSON—With the American border lying alongside the district of New Westminster; with the facilities for smuggling liquors across that border; with the impossibility of preventing it from being carried across that border; it would be madness to pass such an amendment as that, and the hon. gentleman knows just as well as I do that it would be an impossibility to prevent smuggling from the United States. He knows that probably it exists to-day, and just as soon as the Act would be passed smuggling would be increased. There can be no doubt about it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It seems to me the words should be expunged for another reason; that reason is this: that unless we expunge the word "except," the city of New Westminster would not vote anywhere at all under this Temperance Act. It would not vote as a city apart from the rest of the country, because it is not an electoral district. It ought to vote in the electoral district on this subject, and unless it so votes it cannot vote as an individual municipality.

The amendment was adopted.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The other section relating to British Columbia provides that

notice shall be deposited in the registry offices in the respective electoral districts or in sheriffs' offices in such districts. In all British Columbia, there are but two registry offices and two sheriff's offices, and it is quite obvious that the requirements of the Act could not be met by depositing the petitions in these offices only, they are so remote from other parts of the country. The hon. member from New Westminster has given notice of an amendment, to strike out this third section and substitute in place thereof the amendment of which he has given notice. I have only to say that, so far from having any objection to the amendment, I think it would be a very great improvement to the Bill. It is absolutely necessary, in fact, in order to make the Bill workable in that province.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B. C.)—As the hon. gentleman from Sarnia has very properly said, we have only two sheriffs in the whole of the province, one at Victoria and the other at New Westminster, and we have only two registry offices in the province, one at Victoria and the other at New Westminster. The electoral districts of Cariboo, Yale and Vancouver, have no such offices at all. Consequently, if the Bill is passed in its present state, there will be no place for depositing those notices. I, therefore, move that section 3 be struck out, and that the following be substituted therefor :—

The notice provided for in section 6 of the Act shall, so far as it relates to British Columbia, be deposited in the respective Electoral Districts as follows :—

1. Cariboo Electoral District, in the office of the Registrar of Voters, Village of Barkerville.
2. Yale Electoral District, in the office of the Registrar of Voters, Village of Kamloops.
3. New Westminster Electoral District, in the office of the Registrar of Voters, City of New Westminster.
4. Victoria Electoral District, in the office of the Registrar of Voters, City of Victoria.
5. Vancouver Electoral District, in the office of the Registrar of Voters, City of Nanaimo.

The amendment was adopted.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Section 4 of this Bill is an amendment to section 96 of the original Canada Temperance Act, by simply adding thereto the words—

"All courts, judges, justices of the peace, magistrates, judicial and other officers, shall take notice of such order-in-council, so published as aforesaid, in any proceeding under this Act, without its being specially pleaded or referred to, and no evidence thereof shall be required to be given in any precaution under this Act."

I need scarcely call attention to the absolute necessity for some such provision as this, in order to make the Act workable in the country districts. It is impossible there that people shall have at hand ready to produce before magistrates, or in courts, certified copies of orders-in-council, of the *Gazette* containing notices, and of various other documents which might be technically considered necessary, in order to prove a fact which no person doubts, and the evidence of which has been made public in a very full and sufficient manner. This is asking no new privilege; it has been attached to other bills, and I cannot see any possible objection to requiring judges and other judicial officers to take notice of orders-in-council published in the *Canada Gazette*, on any proceedings under this Act, as sufficient evidence that the law is in force, without requiring copies of official documents duly certified to be produced.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I should like to ask the hon. member who has charge of the Bill, as I have not had an opportunity of referring to sec. 96, whether it is provided in that section that the proclamation shall be published in the *Canada Gazette* ?

HON. MR. VIDAL—Yes, it is.

HON. MR. DICKEY—It appears to me, in order to prevent confusion, this clause ought to have provided that the proclamation in the official *Gazette* should be sufficient, without any further evidence. The rule with regard to other matters has always been to state that the proclamation in the official *Gazette* shall be evidence of itself, without any further proof. That would make the clause clear and intelligible.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I understand that some magistrates have objected to the production of the *Canada Gazette* as not being sufficient evidence,

and have required certified copies, and this is to obviate the necessity of procuring such certified copies. It can be done either in the way that my hon. friend proposes, which would probably be the more regular way, or in the manner in which the Bill provides.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The Bill has been drawn up by a gentleman of the very highest legal standing, who thought that this was the best way that the difficulty could be met.

The clause was adopted.

HON. MR. VIDAL—In moving the adoption of section 5, I may repeat an observation which I made in introducing the Bill. The two or three alterations which are proposed, as they are given here, certainly throw no light on the effect of the clause as it will be, though having that clause before one it will be seen that the amendments are very simple. I should be disposed to strike out the 5th section and re-enact it with the amendments, but there is a consolidation of the laws being made now, and I think that the amended Act can be introduced without difficulty in that consolidation. I think, therefore, that we might safely adopt the Bill as it stands. This was a mere clerical error. The other portion of the clause has been several times before this House—it was the restriction attached to the sale under a doctor's certificate that the quantity was not to be less than one pint. The original object was to prevent tippling. I never did exactly approve of it myself, and it is now proposed to strike out the words, leaving unlimited power to physicians to prescribe what they see fit. Some object very strongly to the limit being taken away, though I think, while we may occasionally find a physician who is not fit to be entrusted with the power, that the profession stands so high that we can safely leave the matter to their discretion. The latter portion of the clause was considered necessary apparently by the House of Commons. It is one that I have little or nothing to say about. I suppose it is well that violations of the law should be punished, and it is not necessary to suppose, because the penalty is provided, that infractions will take place.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am very glad that my hon. friend puts so much confidence just now in the medical profession. I thought the general principle of this Bill was to prevent tippling. When the Bill was before the House for the second reading the other day, the hon. member from Amherst remarked on this clause, that instead of preventing tippling, it was rather encouraging it, and that a man could, under the amendment, take his dram without scruple.

HON. MR. POWER—How many scruples to the dram?

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think it is rather encouraging tippling, than otherwise, but I am glad to find my hon. friend's confidence in the medical profession is increasing.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I beg to be allowed to disclaim being the author of that very bad pun, that in any act in which my hon. friend from Sarnia had a hand, he should be supposed to be guilty of legislating for taking a dram without a scruple. Curious complications have arisen with regard to this section, to which my hon. friend, with his usual modesty, has not referred. Last year, when we were considering the amendments to this Act, an hon. member—I think the hon. member from Alexandria—moved substantially, this very amendment.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Oh, no!

HON. MR. DICKEY—The amendment was that the quantity should be restricted to not more than one pint—in any quantity less if you like, but not more. The extraordinary part of that was, that the amendment was voted down by the promoters of the Scott Act, with the single exception of the hon. member from Sarnia, who has been, I admit, consistent throughout on this matter. He voted with the minority, and voted that these words should be put in. If that amendment had been adopted, this portion of the Bill would have been unnecessary, because it would have made it clear that no one could sell more than a pint Now my hon. friend is kind enough to allow the sale of any quantity—even a dram, without a scruple.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I, myself, was very strongly in favor of the amendment, but it will be remembered that the Minister of the Interior who had charge of this Bill on behalf of the Government, stated to those gentlemen who favored the amendment that the condition on which he and the Government agreed to support this Bill was that no change should be made. When the proposition came from the hon. member from Glengarry I felt that it was one in the right direction, one which would protect the profession from any improper observations in the future; and I was most anxious to support it. The Minister of the Interior, however, had placed this obligation on us, that we should ask for no change, and had promised that if we would take the Bill as it stood, without change, his assistance would be given to it. For that reason and that reason alone did I vote for it—to keep faith with the Government—but believing that the proposition made by my hon. friend was the true one, if he makes it now I shall not only vote and say all I can for it, but I shall be extremely glad to have the change made, and I think he will confer a great benefit on the profession if he will take that course.

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—I gave notice when this Blll came up that I would move the following amendment :—

"Provided, however, that duly licensed medical practitioners may purchase and dispense alcoholic liquors for exclusively medicinal purposes and not otherwise."

I would like to add to that also a further amendment, so far as druggists are concerned :—

"Provided also that nothing in the Act shall be held to interfere with the sale by druggists or physicians of the officinal preparations of the authorized pharmacopoeas when made of full medicinal strength, and sold only for medicinal purposes, nor with the dispensing of physicians' prescriptions containing spirituous liquors in quantities of not more than eight ounces at any one time, nor with the sale of any patent medicine unless such patent medicine is known to the vendor to be capable of being used as a beverage, the sale of which is a violation of 'The Canada Temperance Act 1878.'"

I may say that the druggists are desirous of having that amendment added also. The object of this amendment is to remove a doubt that exists in the minds of legal gentlemen as to the construction of this clause.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I think it would be better to have this amendment on the paper before we consider it—not only the one that has been for some time on the paper, but the amendment by which he proposes to exempt the druggists from any penalties for selling prescriptions although they may contain a very large percentage of alcohol. It is an important proposition, and I should like to see it in print before it is submitted to the House.

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—I have no objection. I think the suggestion is a good one, because it may be thought that I am springing it upon the House. I give notice of it now. The clause to which exception is taken provides that from the day on which the part of this Act comes into force in any county or city, or so long thereafter as it continues in force therein, no person, unless it be for exclusively medicinal purposes under the regulations of the 4th sub-section of this section, shall, within such county or city, expose or keep for sale any spirituous or other intoxicating liquors or mixed liquors capable of being used as a beverage, and part of which is spirituous or otherwise intoxicating.

A good many are in doubt as to what is the proper construction to put upon that clause, and some are construing it to mean that a medical man cannot keep in his surgery alcoholic mixtures, or alcohol to prepare mixtures. There are a great many—I suppose the larger portion of the medical men in the Dominion—who are not living convenient to druggists, and consequently are obliged to keep their own preparations, and perhaps to manufacture a good many of them. In order to remove that doubt as to the legality of their keeping alcohol in their surgeries, it is considered desirable, by a great many medical men, to have this provision added. I may say that in the House of Commons the hon. member from Dundas introduced a somewhat similar amendment, but it was not worded quite as strictly as this. That amendment, I may say, was carried in the com-

mittee, but it was rejected by the House. Now, this amendment which I have proposed is as follows :—

"Provided, however, that duly licensed medical practitioners may purchase and dispense alcoholic liquors for exclusively medicinal purposes, and not otherwise."

I think it will be rather an improvement to the Bill than otherwise, and consequently I expect that hon. gentlemen will support it.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I wish to call the attention of the committee to one feature in this amendment, which, I think, is objectionable. The section of the Canada Temperance Act to which this amendment is proposed deals only with the selling or giving away of liquors. My hon. friend purposes to add :—

"Provided, however, that duly licensed medical practitioners may purchase and dispense alcoholic liquors for exclusively medicinal purposes, and not otherwise."

I think that the words "purchase and" should not be in this clause. This is a clause which deals with the selling of liquor. All that the hon. gentleman wants is to authorize medical practitioners to dispense, and not to purchase liquor. There are other provisions in the Bill under which they can get liquor. I do not feel very strongly on it, but I do not think this applies to the purchase of liquor.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—They must purchase in order to dispense them.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I think at the present moment that medical men, from the experience we have had where the Act has been in force, have availed themselves to a very large extent of the privilege of obtaining liquors. From the returns that have been brought before Parliament, it appears that medical men can obtain liquors, from the parties who are at present authorized to dispense them, in unlimited quantities.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—Under the law?

Hon Mr. SCOTT—Under the law as it now stands. I have now before me reports from several counties where the Act is in force where I find the quantity dispensed, is practically unlimited. In one case that I have now before me a medical man gives an order for four gallons of brandy. In another he gives an order for 72 pints of ale or beer, and in another for 10 quarts of whiskey, and so on in unlimited quantities, and therefore I think the medical men have at the present moment as much license as we should give them in this respect. I would much rather my hon. friend would propose that they would be restricted in making prescriptions to a pint. That would be a reform, and would protect the profession from the aspersions that are likely to be cast on them in connection with the giving of certificates.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—You have adopted the pint limit in the law as it stands.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The proposition was to strike it out althogether, leaving the quantity to the discretion of the man who prescribed, and I state in confirmation of that, that the profession have availed themselves of the privilege granted to them by giving these large prescriptions up to five gallons of brandy at a time, and large quantities of ale and beer. I notice in the report before me where a medical man gives an order for 70 pints of ale in one prescription. I suppose the person proposed to have a porter or ale bath. He could not use it in any other way in one prescription.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—According to the hon. gentleman's own admission, this amendment does not make it any worse.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes, it does; it gives the right to dispense to a larger number.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—The law as it now stands enables a medical practitioner to give a medical certificate for any quantity whatever; but he cannot give a certicate for less than a pint. He must give a certificate for a pint or upwards.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—As I understand the amendment of the hon. gentleman from Glengary, it is to provide that a medical practitioner in the country

may buy liquor and keep it in his office for the purpose of being used when he makes up a prescription of which it is a necessary part, and for that purpose he wants the right as a medical practitioner to keep it on the premises and dispense it. In reference to the clause itself, I invite the attention of the committee to this: whether it is quite right to subject a respectable body of gentlemen like the members of the medical profession, to a penalty for a conviction of this kind; it says, "for strictly medicinal purposes," and if they do not give the liquor for strictly medicinal purposes, they are to be subject to a penalty. Who is to be the judge as to whether it is for medicinal purposes or not? If that is brought before a country magistrate who may perhaps be a violent fanatic, he may say that it was not given for medicinal purposes, but for some other purpose, and that may raise a very delicate question, and perhaps a very embarrassing one for an honest practitioner. If he cannot satisfy the magistrate, as a medical man, that he has dispensed the liquor in the line of his profession, it would place him sometimes in a dangerous position.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I quite agree with my hon. friend as to that, and the clause is made still more exceptionally severe upon medical men when you come to consider that, by a sub-section of this Act, we have conferred pretty much the same privileges on priests and ordained clergymen, and to be consistent you should impose the penalty upon them as well as upon the medical men.

HON. MR. POWER—I think the proper cure is to make them liable to the penalty as well as the doctors. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that we have this law at all, but as long as we have it, it should be administered with some sort of fairness, and I know of no reason why a doctor should be allowed to go and buy as much whiskey as he pleases, and consume it or dispose of it as he pleases, when a lawyer or a merchant cannot do the same.

HON. MR. DICKEY—We do it.

HON. MR. POWER—If my hon. friend from Amherst, who lives in a Scott Act county, were walking on a warm day and felt it necessary to take a glass of ale, he would render himself liable to a severe penalty if he did so, while his medical man, who lives a little way from him, is at liberty to go and buy as much liquor as he pleases and dispose of it as he thinks proper, and, I presume, if he used two or three glasses of whiskey he would be at liberty to say that it was for medicinal purposes. I think the returns that my hon. friend from Ottawa has referred to, show that the medical men in the past have stretched the exemption as far as it could go, and certainly further than the law ever intended that trust to be extended. There is a way in which medical men can provide themselves with liquor. Under this Act they can buy liquor in quantities to the extent of a gallon at a time, and more than that I do not think they have any right to expect. I do not consider that it is right to allow a doctor to buy liquor by the gill or a smaller quantity, for that would show that the medical men wanted to tipple and not to dispense liquor.

HON. MR. DEVER—I am opposed to the whole law, but if it is to be passed, I am not inclined to give privileges to medical men and clergymen more than to others. I would like to see the law carried out as a temperance law, but for my part I do not believe it can be enforced. I believe now the druggist can bring in any quantity of alcohol and can sell it; he can sell it as cologne water. I think the hon. gentleman is aware that cologne water is actually alchool; yet the druggist is at liberty to dispose of it in large quantities. If druggists and doctors, and clergymen and priests, have the privilege of using alcohol as they please, the regular dealers, who have been employed in this business all their lives, should not be restricted. I think it is right that I should speak out on this subject holding the views that I do, and vote against those privileges being given to the medical men or clergymen.

HON. MR. McINNES — Become a clergyman.

HON. MR. POWER moved that the amendment be amended, by striking out the words "purchase and."

The motion was lost on a division.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I think you had better repeal the Act if you are going to mutilate it in the way that is proposed.

HON. MR. SMITH—Hear, hear; it is a scandalous Act.

HON. MR. SCOTT—If you are going to mutilate the Act, it would be better to repeal it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This is not mutilating the Act.

HON. MR. SCOTT—We are enabled to judge by experience. A few years ago, I thought the medical men would respond to the trust placed in them by Parliament, in granting them the power to issue certificates; but we find there has been a most open violation of the law; that in the Island of Prince Edward, where the law is in force, some medical men have printed certificates, which they sell at so much apiece, and fill them up for any one that applies for them. I take the returns of a single day, at one drug shop, from the printed return before Parliament, and I find that in Prince County, Prince Edward Island, liquors were dispensed on medical certificates in the following quantities: Brad Black got 12 pints of whiskey; Mrs. James Read, 9 pints of whiskey; Howard Farrow, 8 pints of whiskey; Wm. S. Green, 10 pints of whiskey; Charles Clark, 8 pints of whiskey; T. H. Robble, 80 pints of ale and porter; Brad Black, 18 pints of whiskey; Brad Black, 28 pints of whiskey; H. E. Wright, 16 pints of whiskey: D. Hunt, 24 pints of whiskey; Mr. Kirk, 20 pints of whiskey, and so on through the return.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That has nothing to do with this question.

HON. MR. SCOTT—It has everything to do with this amendment, as the hon. gentleman will see.

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—The amendment says it is for exclusively medicinal purposes.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Were not all those certificates I have referred to for exclusively medicinal purposes?

HON. MR. SMITH—No; the certificates for gin might be.

HON. MR. SCOTT—It is very extraordinary that the hon. gentleman from Toronto should contradict me so boldly when I tell him the fact that the doctors can only give certificates for medicinal purposes; that is the law.

HON. MR. SMITH—You say they do not give it for medicinal purposes.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I say they do take advantage of the privilege accorded to them and give wholesale orders. They sell prescriptions although the law says they shall only give a certificate for liquor for purely medicinal purposes. There is the law.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Will the hon. gentleman give us a return of the physicians who refused to issue those certificates?

HON. MR. SCOTT—Here is the return of liquors dispensed under medical certificates.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Does not my hon. friend see that this amendment is limiting it to medicinal purposes?

HON. MR. SCOTT—Was not all this dispensed for medicinal purposes? The law says there shall be no sale of liquor only under a certain condition, and that condition is that a medical man shall prescribe it for medicinal purposes.

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—How will the medical man that resides out in the country, 40 miles away from the druggist, give a prescription containing alcohol if he is not allowed to keep it in his office?

HON. MR. SCOTT—That is not the point we are discussing. What I am saying is this: that Parliament having trusted the medical profession with the right to give certificates for unlimited quantities, and in the belief that they would limit it to the quantities actually required for the special cases, some of them have abused that trust. There are many who

believe that alcohol is useful in medicine. I do not believe it myself, but in deference to the views of the many gentlemen who think differently, I consented to their being allowed the privilege of issuing certificates, but on the express understanding that medical men who gave those certificates would give them for medicinal purposes only, and that those certificates should be fyled with the druggist, and that the druggist should make a return to Parliament of those prescriptions. I was reading from this official return, made by this druggist, of the doctors who ordered gin, brandy and other liquors for the people. I have the names of the doctors who issued the certificates, the names of the persons for whom these prescriptions were made, and the name of the druggist. There is all the evidence necessary, and I have proceeded to read what was done in one drug shop in a single day, so that the House can understand how this privilege has been abused, and I ask, if the privilege has been abused to that extent with the limitations that the doctor himself would have to send the applicant to the drug shop and the druggist would have to make a return of those prescriptions to Parliament, am I not perfectly justified in saying the abuse would be ten times greater if this amendment were allowed? I cannot understand any medical gentleman who has any respect for his profession supporting it. I am perfectly justified in believing that if we enlarge this privilege, which now certainly seems large enough to destroy the real value of the Act, we are making a perfect farce of the Act.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—I would like to know what is to be done when there is no druggist at hand?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The statute provides that other parties may be named as vendors.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—Why not trust the doctor, as well as anybody else?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The law, as it stands to-day, provides that if there is no druggist in the neighborhood, other vendors may be named. They may name a doctor if they like; I should rather see doctors' names in all cases, if they kept the returns, but I do not think you ought to do it without that proviso. When this Bill was under consideration, and the suggestion was made that there should be other vendors appointed, I limited it to druggists, as we all thought that the drug shop would be the best depository. It was then suggested that there were localities where no druggist could be found, and against my own judgment the words "and other vendors" were added. Among other provisions, the License Act repealed the druggist clause altogether, or rather repealed it in this way—by transferring the power of giving the license to the druggist from the Lieutenant-Governor of the province to the Board of Commissioners, and they are the people who to-day make the selection, and they, by the interpretation put upon this Act, give the right to the doctors, or to the tavern keepers, or to anybody else to sell the liquor, and as a matter of fact they have absolutely appointed, in the county of Huron, where the Act was carried the other day by a large vote, the tavern keepers who have been put out of business by the passage of the Act, to dispense the liquor instead of the druggist. I say the Act has been made a perfect farce of.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—It shows the difficulty of enforcing such an Act.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I had faith enough in all the Provincial Governments that they would faithfully and honestly carry out the Act, if officers who are not favorable to it, and who have no moral responsibility in carrying it out, were not allowed to interfere with them; but under such circumstances the law is powerless. It cannot be put in force unless you have officers to enforce it, and it is very much better that it should not exist at all, than be a dead letter. I do not hesitate to say that if the Act is not supported by public opinion and by the authorities, it is infinitely better not to make a farce of the statutes of the country, because it will degenerate still further, and there will be practically free trade in liquor when there is no license. The Act has some defects, owing to a want of geographical knowledge, and a want of officials to carry it out, but as far as the power to put the

Act in force is concerned, it has all the executive action, if there were individuals behind it to enforce it, once it is carried in a county. But if the License Commissioners choose to defeat it they can do so readily under the License Act, and I ask hon. gentlemen if it is a fair interpretation of the intention of Parliament when the License Commissioners give to the tavern-keeper, not to the druggist or doctors, the right to dispense liquor under a doctor's prescription ?

Hon. Mr. SMITH—They are not tavern-keepers—they were tavern-keepers.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I stand corrected; they are not tavern keepers. There are no tavern keepers now; they are dispensers of liquor. They close their taverns on the 30th April, and on the 1st of May they are licensed by the Licensed Commissioners to sell liquor on doctor's prescriptions, in any quantity they please.

Hon. Mr. SMITH—It only shows the absurdity of the law.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I object to any change in this clause, because it is now too broad. I think it ought to be the object of every medical man to place the law in such a position that weak members of the profession would not have an opportunity to abuse their trust and bring the whole profession into discredit. I have the medical returns here from which I was reading to the House the sales under different prescriptions—when hon. members stopped me. I have shown cases in which from 8 to 12 pints of whis key have been given in one prescription. Now, my hon. friend will not say that that was carrying out the spirit of the Act. He has too much candor, and too much common sense, to justify the conduct of the doctor who gave such certificate. He cannot pretend to justify Dr. McKay in giving 6 pints of brandy in one day as one prescription.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—Purchased in one day—my hon. friend does not suppose that it was drunk in one day.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I ask my hon. friend from Glengary, or any hon. gentleman, whether he will say that 16 pints of brandy can, in any sense, be called a prescription ?

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—It shows that the recipient had great capacity for liquor.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It shows that certainly; but I do not think my hon. friend will contend that it was an honest prescription.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think my hon. friend is unreasonable in this. He tells us what the medical men can do now—that they can order so much from the druggist, and he makes that a ground for objecting to the amendment of the hon. member from Glengary, which seems to me either to be unnecessary altogether, or if it should pass, would have a tendency to limit this evil.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—How so ?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Because it says that the medical man can purchase and dispense; but my hon. friend says that he will not have to make the return that the druggist has to make now. You can amend that, however, by saying that nothing in this clause shall prevent him from making the same return that the druggists now do under the Act. Why should not my hon. friend from Glengary, who lives twenty or thirty miles from any licensed vendor of liquor, not have an opportunity of dispensing it ? It is quite as fair and reasonable to suppose that a medical man is honest and upright, as to suppose that even in the face of those instances that have been referred to by the hon. gentleman opposite, he is going to abuse the trust that is reposed in him. If my hon. friend will add a clause requiring medical men who dispense to make a return, the same as other parties who are licensed to dispense liquors, there can be no objection to it, and all the abuse which has been mentioned, and properly mentioned, as having arisen under the Act as it is now, is not going to be increased by adopting this amendment.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The law is not infringed in that particular.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This amendment might be necessary, and if it is necessary, place in it the same restriction that medical men have placed on them now.

HON. MR. SCOTT—It cannot be done, because as it is now it is the druggist who makes the return and dispenses the liquor. If you compel the doctor to make the return he has nobody to check him, but if he is compelled to make it under oath, there cannot be so much objection to it.

HON. MR. McMILLAN—My hon. friend does not appear to make a proper distinction between a certificate and a prescription.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Those are all prescriptions; I have read nothing but prescriptions.

HON. MR. McMILLAN—They are certificates under the Scott Act.

HON. MR. SCOTT—They can only be given as prescriptions.

HON. MR. McMILLAN—Decidedly not. The patient or the patient's friend calls on the doctor, and he simply gives him a certificate to go to the druggist, and he gets whatever liquor he wants. I do not know that it is incumbent on the medical man to name the quantity, and I think my hon. friend is very inconsistent to-day in saying that the medical men have betrayed their trust; for it was the hon. gentleman and his friends that asked the House to strike out the words "not less than a pint," and made the clause worse than it was. It is not incumbent on a medical man to name the quantity of liquor, and if he gives a certificate to the friend of the patient, he may buy ten gallons for all the medical man may know. I have myself given certificates without naming the quantity, because the law did not require me to do so. This amendment is simply to give to the medical profession the privilege of keeping liquor in surgeries for the purpose of compounding medicine and dispensing it to patients, where druggists' shops are not convenient. It is not intended for any other purpose than that, and I think it is really too bad that the medical profession should be held up to odium and disrepute in this House, and all through the country, in the way it has been in the debate on this question. There are, I admit, a few medical men, as well as men in other professions, who violate the law, and do things that are mean and contemptible; but there are nearly 6,000 medical men in the country, and I do not think the temperance men are doing themselves justice when they array a body of such influence throughout the Dominion against them.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman states that a doctor is not bound to give a limited quantity. The doctor is bound to prescribe it, and bound to make an affirmation that it is a prescription. I suppose if he makes a prescription he fixes the quantity that the patient is to take. Not only has he to give the certificate but he must affirm that it is for the person, named therein.

HON. MR. McMILLAN—It may be a pint or ten gallons.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—The remarks of my hon. friend from Ottawa, as regards the medical men of Prince Edward Island, were rather indiscriminate. Some of them, personal friends of mine, are about as upright and honorable men as can be found anywhere. The evil is in the Act that they have had to administer. It is a difficult thing for a medical man to discriminate between actual disease, and what is likely to become so, if an accustomed stimulant is refused. A person who is in a delicate state of health caused by unusual abstinence from his accustomed glass of fermented liquor, may apply to a doctor who may see quite clearly that the case is likely to result in actual disease, and surely he ought to anticipate that disease by giving the necessary liquor to prevent it. It is a very nice line of demarcation between these two points, what is disease, and what is in danger of becoming so; and, therefore, I do not see that the doctors are to be blamed, if acting on this necessity, they have ordered the use of liquor. What I want to call attention to is that a close study of this return would show that some medical men, even in Princes County, have acted with proper

discretion in this matter. The whole return is just an illustration of the utter inefficiency of this Canada Temperance Act of 1878. It is clear to me that if the parties who have thus obtained liquor in undue quantities through the assistance of medical men had not obtained it in that manner they would have obtained it in some way perhaps more objectionable. At least they have had this advantage, that the liquor they obtained in the druggist shop was generally of a fair genuine quality, whereas if they had been driven to obtain it in other ways it might have been some vile compound which would have been attended with injurious effects.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—The hon. gentleman from Ottawa seems to have a terrible fear of the retired tavern-keepers. He is in favor of the druggist being entrusted with the sale of liquors. I am aware of a case where a druggist dispenses wine at $1.50 a bottle, the actual value of which is only 50 cents, and this is the way that this law is operating all over the Dominion. Instead of wine of good quality being had at the regular prices, people are compelled to procure it from druggists, at extortionate prices.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—I may mention, for the benefit of the hon. member from Ottawa, that many cases occur in which a good deal of liquor is required. For instance, in cases of consumption, the medical man, in all probability, would say, in the first instance, take a tablespoonful of cod liver oil and a glass of liquor, three times a day, until the symptoms cease. The man may not care for the liquor any more than for the cod liver oil, but he takes it because the doctor orders it. How could the doctor, in that case, tell how much liquor the man would have to take? Under the Scott Act, he could buy ten gallons and get off scot free; but if he bought 9 gallons and 3 pints he would run the risk of being imprisoned for three months.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—I really think that the gentlemen who are promoting this Bill, are making a mistake. It seems a very reasonable thing to permit this; it is evident that it is the sense of the House that this should pass, and I do not think that anything is gained by attempting to oppose it. Whenever my hon. friend from Ottawa rises to speak on this subject, he adds to my conviction that the law is one which cannot be put in operation satisfactorily to himself or to anybody else. He acknowledges the fact whenever he speaks upon the subject, as does my hon. friend from Sarnia.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I do not acknowledge anything of the kind.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman acknowledges the fact by the statements that he makes. The promoters of this legislation put an amount of machinery on the statute book which cannot be made to work because it is repugnant to the sense of the community, and the bottom of the whole thing is that it is put on the community without the vote of the majority for its acceptance. There is the trouble which lies at the bottom of everything, and the hon. gentleman may make as many amendments to his Act as he likes, but still it will be imperfect, because it will lack the essential element of being acceptable to the people.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—I think the hon. gentleman makes a very great mistake when he ventures to prophesy with his very limited acquaintance with the right feeling of the people of Canada. If he would take the evidence which the people have unmistakably given as to the view which they hold of the importance of this matter, he could not utter the sentiments which he has expressed now.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman has forgotten the figures that I gave him recently.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—I have not forgotten anything. I attach very little importance to the hon gentleman's figures because they had very little bearing on the question before us. He says this Bill cannot be put in operation; what kind of character is that to give the people of Canada to say that a law which stands on the statute book cannot be put in operation.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The Act is defective; not the people.

HON. MR. VIDAL—If the Act is defective, what is the duty of Parliament? Is it not, when defects are pointed out, to remedy them?

HON. MR. PLUMB—You have had it all your own way.

HON. MR. VIDAL—No, we have not had it our own way, but we are going to have it all our own way. There is no doubt in my mind that we will have it our own way at last. The hon. gentleman says the Temperance Act does not rest on the recognized approval of the people. How does the law come into operation? It cannot be given effect to anywhere unless by the vote of the majority of the people.

HON. MR. ALMON—No, not the majority of the people.

HON. MR. VIDAL—A majority of those who record their votes. What other way have we under the British system of getting the views of the people? The majority of ballots cast in an election determines the fate of governments, the fate of policies, the future of the whole country, and shall not the ballot-box be taken as an indication of the will of the people, when a majority of the votes recorded are in favour of the Scott Act? I challenge any hon. gentleman accepting the principles of the British Constitution to point out any fallacy whatever in the statement which we make, that we have the voice of the people with us on this great question.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—No, no.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Most emphatically I say we have. As a matter of opinion, I have just as good a right to mine as my hon. friend has to his, and I adhere to it tenaciously, because after a long and careful investigation, and after making myself master of the question, I have come to that conclusion. With reference to the matter which is before us I cannot consent, for my part, to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member from Glengarry, and for this reason—I believe it is entirely unnecessary. I believe that every facility which is required, for a physician to prescribe and to have alcohol if he requires it to mix his medicines, is open to him now without hindrance or molestation.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B.C.)—Will the hon. gentlemen point out the section which empowers a physician to have alcohol?

HON. MR. VIDAL—The section was pointed out by my hon. friend from Ottawa. What does the hon. gentleman from Glengarry propose now? To put it in the hands of some persons—I frankly admit they would form a contemptible minority of the medical profession—to abuse this power, and to make a pecuniary profit by the sale of liquors. That is an important feature of the question to be taken into consideration. It is not necessary, in carrying out the duties of their profession, that they should have any such power given to them as is proposed by this amendment. This very question has been submitted to the House of Commons, and that House has very distinctly refused to engraft such an amendment on the Bill.

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—Not this amendment.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Not this amendment in its identical words, but an amendment having the same object in view—an amendment to provide that nothing in this Act shall interfere with the right of medical men to keep and dispense alcohol for professional purposes. There is, perhaps, less in it than in my hon. friend's amendment, but the question of the propriety of trusting this power to medical men was fairly discussed in the other House, and rejected. Where is the use of our adopting this amendment, since it has already been decidedly rejected in the other House, and it cannot again come up for consideration in the same session. I do not mean to say that the action of the House of Commons is to be considered so binding on us that we are not to use our own discretion and judgment, but I do say that we ought to take cognizance of their action, and it ought to have some effect on our minds and make us hesitate to take a stand in opposition to that

House unless some great principle is involved, or some great danger apprehended. I am very sorry that I cannot accept the amendment of the hon. member from Glengarry, but I consider it would be a mistake to do so.

HON. MR. DICKEY—My hon. friend believes that this amendment is unnecessary. If it be unnecessary there cannot be any great harm, at all events from his point of view, in adopting it. But I agree very much with what the senior member for Halifax has said, that these words, "purchase and" are entirely superfluous and unnecessary. It would be better to drop them out and let us say "dispense." Perhaps we might allow this amendment for the present, in committee, to be carried and let it be contested on the third reading.

HON. MR. FLINT—I am very sorry to observe that we are getting rather warm on this question. I think we should proceed to the examination of the clauses of this Bill calmly, and deal with them candidly and freely, and that we should not get into a fever heat about them, because that can do no good. The eyes of the public are on us at the present time, and although this Bill may be so mutilated before we get through with it, that its promoters will hardly recognize it as the same measure, yet, notwithstanding that, I think we should be careful in all we do. Let us act honestly, uprightly and fearlessly in dealing with every clause of it. For my own part, I intend to take that course, and I intend to deal with the subject calmly, and to speak in such a way that every member of this House will know what I mean. If, on the one hand, the Bill should be so mutilated that it cannot become law, we who support it, will have to put up with it. If, on the other hand, it can be amended in any way which will make it more efficient, I think those on the opposite side of the question should also be prepared for that result. Some say that the Act cannot be worked. Now, I say in reply to that that there is no law upon the statute book which can be worked if people are determined to break it. You can make laws to prevent murder, theft, housebreaking and other crimes, yet there will always be some persons who will violate them. Those who are in favor of the liquor dealers and the liquor traffic, and those who like their glass will oppose the law with all their might and main. Let them go on if they choose to do so, but the end will come bye and bye. I am confident that in the end the victory will be on our side. With regard to this amendment, it strikes me that the fine imposed upon medical men who violate the Act, should be done away with. I do not think that all our medical men are like the one that has been referred to. We have gentlemen in the profession of the highest standing, who are incapable of wrong doing, but on the other hand, I think there are a few who do not care what they do so long as they can make money or gain popularity. There are black sheep in every flock, and probably there are as many black sheep in proportion to their number in the medical profession, as in any other class of the community; but it is said that a little black wool mixed with the white sometimes makes better yarn. We will try to get the Bill through, and if it does not pass to suit us, we will trust to the other House to protect the interests of the temperance people.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—I suggest that it would be as well to leave out the words "purchase and." There are means now by which a medical man can procure liquor.

The words "purchase and" were struck out, and the committee divided on the motion as amended, which was adopted; contents 35, non-contents 16.

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—I think the discussion that we had upon the former clause really covers this one.

HON. MR. ODELL—I have an amendment which I want to move to the section itself. The amendment of the hon. gentleman is to a sub-section; the amendment I propose is to the 5th clause itself.

HON. MR. DICKEY—If the hon, gentleman looks at the notice-paper he will find that the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman from Glengarry is to the 5th clause, commencing at line 13.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It proposes to leave out the provision for fining the medical men for selling for other than medicinal purposes.

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—That is all; I therefore move the amendment of which I have given notice, that the 5th clause of the Bill be amended by leaving out from the word "sale" in the thirteenth line, to "2" in line twenty-two.

HON. MR. POWER—I should like to ask my hon. friend what his objection is to the portion of the clause which he proposes to strike out?

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—Medical men are liable to a fine of from $20 to $40, when other parties, who are allowed to give certificates on the same conditions are not subject to the same fine. For instance, clergymen and priests can give certificates, and those gentlemen are not subject to a penalty, and it makes a very invidious distinction.

HON. MR. POWER—The better way to remove the invidious distinction is to put them all on the same footing. If we propose to repeal this Act altogether, well and good. If, when hon. gentlemen think there is any chance of doing that, they will move in it, I shall be very glad to assist them; but, while the Act is on the statute book, I think it is not fair to try to destroy its effect by filibustering amendments.

HON. MR. PLUMB—By what?

HON. MR. POWER—By fillibustering amendments. What object is there in providing that a medical man shall not prescribe liquor except for medicinal purposes, if there is no penalty for his violating the law? You must have a penalty in order to enforce the law, and it is only proper that a medical man should be punished as well as any other man if he violates the law. If a clergyman violates the law I do not know of any reason why he should not be punished as well as a medical man or anybody else, and I think the proper way to amend this Bill is to add to the sub-section a provision that any such person shall be liable to the same penalty for improperly giving certificates, as a medical man. I shall be prepared to move it if my suggestion is accepted.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I shall object to such an amendment. This law is generally administered by fanatics, and it would not be fair to drag a medical man or a clergyman before such persons for trial. Medical men will not abuse such a trust as this, because their object is to heal the sick, and not to abuse the law. I say that it is throwing an insult upon the profession to propose such an amendment. I am surprised at my hon. friend attempting to put the medical profession, or the clergy, in such a humiliating position as to have them dragged before a court and tried by blind fanatics whose zeal outweighs their judgment on this question.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I am rather surprised at my hon. friend from Halifax making such an attack as he has done on the hon. gentleman from Sarnia. He has spoken of this amendment as a fillibustering amendment; yet who brought it in? Why, the people who framed and promoted the Scott Act. My hon. friend who made this motion has not asked for any amendment to the Act; he has asked to strike out a fillibustering amendment that is put into the Act by this very section, and therefore it is hardly fair towards the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill to speak of the amendment in that way. Of course I speak jocularly, but one cannot overlook it. Now, with regard to the words that are to be struck out, I just put it to the House, is it fair that medical men who for the last seven years have been entrusted by Parliament with this duty, the responsibility of which they know very well, are now to be put under a penalty, and under what circumstances? You say that they may be brought before any one justice; that justice may be a gentleman of very strong convictions—I am not calling him a fanatic, but he may have very strong convictions—and that justice is selected by the prosecutor who brings the suit. He can take his choice of any magistrate in the district, and put a medical man, under those circumstances, in very great peril, and perhaps destroy his character as a physician.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B.C.)—Cannot he appeal to a higher court?

HON. MR. DICKEY—He may be taken before one or more justices; he may be taken before three if he likes, or it may be before any one justice, at the discretion and the selection of the party who prosecutes; but you have not even put in the ordinary protection that it shall be a higher officer or stipendiary magistrate, and in the country districts we know very well how it would work. It would be an instrument of tyranny, and a mode of punishing people under fanatical influences, and I do not think it is legislation that ought to pass. And has the committee considered this? If you pass that clause, you cannot in all consistency refuse to make it applicable to the next one, the one with reference to the clergymen and ordained ministers of this country. Are you going to impose such a penalty on them? To be consistent you must do it, and if you do it you link together those men who have been spoken of in such strong terms by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa, and the priests and ordained clergymen. I do not think the committee will hesitate for a moment to leave the law as it stands, and not to make a fillibustering amendment. When medical men are bound strictly to give liquor only for exclusively medicinal purposes, it is better to leave them to be the judges of it.

HON. MR. MCINNES, (B.C.)—Is there not an appeal from the conviction of one or more magistrates to any superior court?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am really not able to answer my hon. friend off-hand under this Act.

HON. MR. VIDAL—There is no appeal from the stipendiary magistrate, but there is from an ordinary magistrate.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It seems to me that this proposed amendment ought not to carry. I do not think it is fair to the medical profession, and I do not think it would be carried out in any fair sense at all towards them. It says that they are to be fined if they give spirits for any other but strictly medicinal purposes. Who is to be the judge of that? Surely the medical men themselves are the only judges of what is strictly medicinal. If you put them under a penalty, you must do the same with the clergymen, and you must oblige them to submit themselves to the opinion of men who are not half as well able to judge what is proper for medicinal purposes as they are; but supposing that instances have occurred in which medical men have abused the trust reposed in them by Parliament, there is no contention that the great bulk of the medical profession will do what is wrong in this matter. There are, of course, a few black sheep amongst them, as in other professions, but you should not legislate against the whole profession because some of them do wrong, and it is placing them in great danger, because they would have to satisfy men who in some cases would never be satisfied that the liquor dispensed was for medicinal purposes.

HON. MR. WARK—There are numbers of the medical men who are not to be trusted with this license. When it is proved that clergymen are not to be trusted with it, it will be time to impose the penalty on them. The men who give the certificates ought to be licensed, and the authorities who grant the licenses ought to have the power to withdraw the license when it is found that the party who has it abuses it. That would meet the case if the House is not disposed to pass the clause as it stands.

HON. MR. POWER—I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this point. This Bill was considered at some length in the other House.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—That is no argument.

HON. MR. POWER—This particular amendment was considered attentively; we propose to make certain amendments to this Bill, which are amendments of some consequence. This is an amendment which I think is not of much consequence; but the effect of our making so many amendments on matters that have been recently passed upon by the Commons, will be to render that Chamber

disinclined to accept important amendments upon points which they have not dealt with. I put that to the House simply as a matter of business.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think that that is a fair proposition to put to the House. We should deal with all those questions according to our own view of what is right, and what ought to be done, let the fate of the Bill be what it may. I do not think we are to consider what was done in the Lower House, or what course they may pursue, in case we fail to do exactly what they may consider we should do. This amendment proposes a thing which the majority of the House, I think, consider unfair, and we ought to vote according to our conviction.

HON. MR. DEVER—I understood that the great complaint by certain gentlemen against this House is, that we are merely a recording committee; and now the hon. gentleman from Halifax seems to be going the other way.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. ALMON—I scarcely think that the penalty under this act is large enough. Any medical man who gives a certificate for any other than strictly medicinal purposes shall, for the first offence, be fined $20, and the second $40, or in default, imprisonment for three months. In the Act itself, it is provided that, if a man is found within half a mile of a polling-booth during an election, with a walking-stick, and is asked to give it up, and refuses to do so, he is fined $100. I think the penalty in this clause is too light.

On the 10th clause,

HON SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: I object to these forms. I do not think it wise to make those special forms of information and forms of conviction. We are trying all the time to bring those things under one general rule; to give forms for all convictions and informations under the Summary Convictions Act; and if from time to time we pass exceptional Acts like this, and provide special forms, we shall only get further into difficulties. I ask the House is it specially desirable to have those special forms? For my part I do not think it is. It seems to me that the hon. gentlemen who are in favor of this Act had better be content with the forms in the Summary Convictions' Act, and strike these out. There is no difficulty in specifying the offence under this Act, and I think it would be better not to make a special form.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The forms here are only permissive, and not absolute. It has been found in preparing the charge it very often falls to a tribunal that for the first time has had occasion to prepare it, and therefore they do not know the words to use in the form, and I do not see any objection to having these forms prepared for them.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I would suggest to my hon. friend from Sarnia the leaving out all the words down to the word "where" in the 13th line, so that it would provide that the information shall be made upon the oath of the party complainant substantiating the information. That would give an enactment which the temperance people want on that subject, and would leave out all about the forms.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I would like to call attention to this feature in connection with the schedules. The latter part of the clause is a very proper amendment to the law, and I do not think there can be any possible objection to it. That is the one which provides that the information, where it is not laid by the proper officer, shall be made upon oath; but if my hon. friend will look at the form of information, No. 1 of the schedule, he will find it is only to be "laid and signed before me," instead of sworn. It should be sworn. These schedules of forms were framed, I suppose, before that clause was passed. It was an amendment which, I believe, was inserted in the House of Commons.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It would be better to leave the forms out altogether.

HON. MR. DICKEY—It is another reason for leaving them all out.

HON. MR. POWER—I venture to differ from the Minister of Justice on the

question of forms. The object of these forms, of course, is to give the persons who are proceeding under the Act information as to the way in which they are to proceed, and I know that there are some gentlemen who wish to proceed, very often without knowing what they are doing, like my hon. friend from Niagara.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. POWER—But generally people prefer to know what they are about; and these forms which indicate the line which has to be taken in cases of prosecutions for different offences against the Temperance Act, will be found very convenient and useful; and I think it would be much to be regretted if they were struck out. When a man wishes to proceed against a party who has violated the Act, he gets the form here; he has not to look through the Act of 1869, to see how the forms of that Act can be altered so as to be adapted to a case under this Act. He gets the form here with the adaptation already made, and it would be a pity, when the promoters of the Bill have taken such care in framing those forms, that their labor should be thrown away. I did not understand that the Minister of Justice had any objection to those forms, cxeept that they were making special legislation when the general legislation would do; but this is special legislation in this way only—it gives the forms, but it does not alter the procedure Act of 1869. It simply gives a number of forms which are made in conformity with that Act and with the Canada Temperance Act. I think that the schedule would be found to be exceedingly convenient.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—To show my hon. friend how mistaken he is, I may point out to him that these forms deal with offences that are not punishable by summary conviction at all. Number 8 is tampering with a witness; Number 9 is for compromising or compounding a prosecution; Number 10 is for being a party to compromise a prosecution—you cannot deal with these by summary conviction, yet here is a form given for them which shows the danger of prescribing forms where persons are not thoroughly well advised as to the state of the law, and these forms would be merely a snare to parties prosecuting. It is far better to trust to the Law of Summary Convictions.

HON. MR. ODELL—Under the 100th section of the Act which is now amended, the punishment of sale and so forth in violation of the second part of the Act is a fixed fine of $50 for the first offence and $100 for the second offence, with imprisonment for a term of two months if not paid. I want to draw attention to those very forms which become part of the Act, because if you take form Q you will find that not only is the penalty exacted, but in this form, which becomes part of the Act, for the first offence it is fine and imprisonment, and a warrant of commitment under that form adds imprisonment with hard labor. Then, take the form for the third offence, the penalty is fine and imprisonment, and in the warrant of commitment it includes hard labor. In the Act of 1878, the penalties are fixed, and there is no hard labor provided; and it seems to me that that punishment runs through all these forms in some way, though it is not provided under the Act itself.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I think that the question of the hon. member from Halifax has been pretty well answered by the Minister of Justice. These schedules have been taken from the Act of 1883, but they have been altered; they are not the same schedules. I have compared them and have found some alterations of a very important character.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I beg to take issue with the hon. gentleman; I have compared these very carefully with the schedules in the License Act of 1883, and have marked them, and I see that they are the same in every respect, except in those particulars where provisions need to be made for the special features of the Canada Temperance Act. My hon. friend who calls attention to section Q—I cannot understand how he can, with the documents before him, stand up and say that for the first offence, a party may be imprisoned at hard labor.

HON. MR. ODELL—No. I refer to form S. In the Temperance Act the

penalty is fixed, and there is no hard labor in it; and the hon. gentleman cannot show me a case in which imprisonment with hard labor has been given under a conviction under the Temperance Act.

HON. MR. VIDAL—No, we cannot; for the only people who have exposed themselves to such punishment have cleared out and left the country.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPELL moved the amendment, which he suggested, to strike out all the words in the 10th clause down to the word "where," in the thirteenth line.

HON. MR. ALMON—I beg to move the amendment of which I gave notice the other day. I must apologize for being neck and shoulders with the Minister of Justice in his amendment, but it is entirely owing to the conduct of my colleague, the senior member for Halifax. He wanted to move his amendment before mine, and in his hurry to do so, it was thrown out. I gave way to him, every moment thinking that he intended to move his resolution. He did not do so; whether he was sincere in stating it was his intention to move it or not—I suppose he was—certainly his conduct, if I did not know him, would lead me to suppose that he was not sincere.

HON. MR. POWER—My hon. colleague from Halifax has made a charge against me that is altogether unjustifiable. It is true that he spoke to me about moving my amendment; and I proposed to move it at what I thought was the proper stage—when we had disposed of the third clause of this Bill; but at the suggestion of the Minister of Justice that it was better to get through with the undisputed parts of the Bill, I agreed to move my amendment afterwards. The amendment that my hon. friend is going to move is a very important one. It is one which, I think, ought to be discussed carefully and fully; and now at five minutes to six it is not a time when my hon. friend could expect that discussion on his amendment, which its importance deserves, and it would be better to call it six o'clock, and let the debate be continued this evening.

HON. MR. MCMASTER, from the committee, reported that they had made some progress with the Bill, and asked leave to sit again.

The report was received and adopted.

HON. MR. FLINT moved that the debate be adjourned until to-morrow.

The yeas and nays having been called for, the Speaker declared that the vote could not be taken, it being six o'clock.

At six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole, for consideration of Bill (92), "An Act further to amend the Canada Temperance Act 1878, and the Liquor License Act 1883."

HON. MR. ALMON—When the committee rose at 6 o'clock, I was about to move a resolution of which I had given notice some days before. I would have moved it earlier in the day but the senior member from Halifax, although my notice had been given before his, made his antecedent to mine, and therefore I waived my right for him to move this resolution. I waited patiently until 6 o'clock for him to move, but he did not do so. Without waiting longer, I think I had better take the matter into my own hands and move the resolution of which I have given notice. In doing so, as I have already moved this amendment on two different occasions, I may possibly repeat myself, but I shall endeavour not to do so. I am afraid I may do as Dryden says Alexander—not the hon. member from Woodstock, but Alexander of Macedon—did at "the royal feast for Persia won,"—

> "And thrice he routed all his foes;
> And thrice he slew the slain."

I trust I shall not fall into the error that Alexander of Macedon did. The motion, as you are all aware, is to endeavor to introduce in this country the use of light wines and beer, to the exclusion of stronger beverages. Most of you are aware that the distillation of alcohol was discovered by the Saracens about the middle of the 11th century—about the date of William the Conqueror. Prior to that time, though

there had been drunken men, I do not think there were drunkards. We search the Scriptures, and though we find that men were drunk occasionally, and it was reprobated in those writings, yet the cases were very few, and other vices were dwelt on much more frequently. The hon. member from Sarnia knows more about it than I do, perhaps, but I do not think he will find many passages in the Bible that allude to this vice of drunkeness. We come down now to a later time, and we know that Juvenal satirized the vice of his age. We all know, those of us who have had it licked into us, what those vices were, and we know that drunkeness is very little alluded to. Now, to go back to my own profession, I find that Hippocrates, who lived between four and five hundred years before the birth of Christ, kept an account of those patients he attended, and as far as my memory serves me, and I have read his work carefully, I do not remember one case where drunkeness was the cause of the disease. Paulus Aegenitus, who flourished between the second and third centuries after the birth of Christ, and who gives the experience of physicians who lived before his day, does not speak of drunkeness as prevailing, and therefore it is reasonable to suppose that it was not a vice which prevailed before the distillation of alcohol was discovered. Therefore, if we can manage to repress the use of alcohol we can very safely and usefully introduce the use of light wines and beer? If the Temperance Act should ever become—as the hon. member from Sarnia believes and hopes (hoping against hope, I think) that it will be—universally introduced in the country, what will become of the revenue that we derive from the liquor traffic? The Dominion has a much larger debt than it ought to have; the expenses are much larger than they ought to be, and if we knock off six to nine millions of dollars a year from the revenue we will find it hard to make up the amount. If we were obtaining a commensurate benefit, I would not care about the loss of revenue. I, for one, would be willing to lessen my expenses and to pay more taxes to make up the amount, but there will be the same amount of drinking that there is now, and a serious loss to the revenue. We are legislating to encourage trade with France, and I wonder very much, considering that there are so many of our people of French descent and speaking the French language, that we have had so little trade with France. We all know that the chief exports of that country are light wines. There is no use of telling us that drunkeness exists where wine is easily procured. We know that it is not the case. Travellers tell us, and those of us who have been fortunate enough to travel in those countries know, that it is not the case. Why not introduce light wines and beer in this country, and see what the result will be? I have been told that people can get drunk on claret; yes they can, but they have to take a great deal of it. I remember a story of an Irish squireen who was at Dublin, and after drinking claret for about an hour he was asked how he liked it. He said, "it is very nice, but it is mighty taydious drinking." It was something which he could not get drunk comfortably on, unless he had a great deal of time on his hands. But we are told that public opinion is expressed by the petitions which have been presented here; and that we should support this Bill because there are a great many petitions in favor of temperance legislation. Perhaps the hon. member from Sarnia can tell me how many names are attached to the petitions presented this year.

HON. MR. DICKEY — They say 100,000.

HON. MR. ALMON—Then, 100,000 people have said that the Scott Act is a failure. They say it has created dissensions in the several counties where it has been adopted; that it has injured the revenue, and that nothing but prohibition will answer. I think that is a pretty good indication of public opinion, and that the people have no confidence in this ten-gallon temperance Act, as I think I may justly call it. We read the other day a letter from the Venerable Roman Catholic Archbishop of Ontario, stating that the Scott Act was a failure, and that he did not approve of it. His opinion I value, because he is a man of a great deal of learning, and one who stands very high in his denomination. I do not think his opinion would be worth more than anyone else's if it were not for

the backing behind him. He is a shrewd man, and he would not promulgate that view unless he knew that a majority of those who follow him echoed the same sentiment. I think it shows that public opinion is changing on the Scott Act, and that a great many men in Ontario are becoming opposed to it. Take the experience of the hon. member from Charlottetown (Mr. Haythorne). What does he tell us? If there is a place where the Scott Act could be carried out it is in the island of Prince Edward. It is a place which, for five months of the year, is shut out from the outside world, and, therefore, no liquor can be imported there during that time, and the liquor which is imported there during the other seven months of the year must pass through the custom house, and we know who gets it and where it can be sold; yet we are told by the hon. member from Charlottetown that the Scott Act, so far as his province is concerned, is a failure. I was very much amused at the appearance of the countenance of my hon. friend from Sarnia, while the hon. gentleman from Charlottetown was speaking. It put me very much in mind of the Balak and Balaam incident. The hon. member sent for my hon. friend to curse the opponents of the Scott Act.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to explain which of us is Balak.

HON. MR. ALMON—The person who was sent to curse the Israelites was Balaam—at least that was the way it was when I was a little boy going to Sunday school. The hon. member from Sarnia reminded me of Balak, and I was especially interested in the appearance of his countenance whem Balaam, instead of cursing the opponents of the Scott Act, was blessing them and declaring that he was very sorry that he had voted for the Scott Act, because it had proved a complete failure. Like Balaam, from every hill he had viewed the working of the Scott Act, and still could not curse its opponents. He did not sacrifice a bullock and a ram, but he sacrificed his character for political consistency when he said, despite all that, he was going to vote for the Scott Act. Now, these petitions all hail from Ontario. I do not think it is a very difficult thing to get up petitions. I do not mean to say that there is more forgery about these petitions than about others, but the hon. member from Sarnia must see that a good many of them are signed by school children, and that many of them are written certainly by the same hand. Now, if a clergyman goes round to a house and asks the people, "are you opposed to intemperance?" every good woman, and good man, too, will say "yes." Then the clergyman will ask "do you mind putting down your name to a petition to put down intemperance?" Many put down their names under these circumstances, and I do not think that these petitions are entitled to any weight whatever. Looking at this Bill throughout, I trust that my amendment will be adopted. Next year we will put the Bill right. Fancy a man not being able to go within half a mile of a polling place without putting away his walking stick, and being fined $100 if he does not give it up! The whole thing is absurd. Can anyone tell me why a person can buy eight gallons of ale or cider and cannot buy eight gallons of whiskey, but is permitted to buy ten gallons of whiskey, which is a much stronger beverage? It is one of the anomalies in the Act which shows the hasty way in which it was drawn up, and the impossibility of working it. I say, take the case of a poor woman who buys eight gallons of cider and sells a tumbler of it; she likely has a little shop in which she sells ginger-bread, pipes, and spruce beer, and she thinks she can eke out a living by selling cider also. For selling a glass of cider, she is liable to be fined $50 for the first time, $100 the second time, and is imprisoned for two months the third time; and her husband, if she has one, is obliged to be a witness against her. I ask the hon. gentleman from Sarnia, if he had the making of the law, would he incorporate such a clause as that in it? Cider may be intoxicating, but I do not think a gentleman of the size of the hon. member from Sarnia could hold enough to intoxicate him. Then, about ale; why should a poor man be deprived of his beer? He has had a hard day's work; he goes home, and on the way stops at a tavern for a glass of ale. The ale will not make him drunk, but will give him what honest labor has taken out of him, and prepare

him for the next day's work. Now, we come to this ten-gallon Temperance Act. I can understand some hon. gentlemen supporting the Act, from political motives, with a view to gaining popularity and that sort of thing, but I cannot imagine the senior member for Belleville (Mr. Flint) being in favor, working for, and devoting his energy to securing the passage of a measure which allows the rich man to buy ten gallons of whiskey, to keep it in his house and drink it when he likes, and offer it to his friends until they take too much of it, and imagine that he is voting for a Temperance Act—a ten-gallon temperance act! Then, again, I ask the hon. gentleman if this is a Bill which is to put down intemperance, why is there no punishment provided for the person who buys the liquor?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—He gets a headache.

HON. MR. ALMON—Nothing whatever can be done to him, but the person who sells the liquor can be punished, $50 for the first offence, $100 for the second, and imprisoned for two months for the third. I know that the hon. member from Sarnia is sincere; I will not say that his sincerity has not clouded his judgment—I think his zeal has got the better of his discretion—but I appeal to him to abandon this Act altogether, and try to obtain a proper license law. Take up any of our papers, published in Halifax, Toronto, Ottawa, or any other city, and what do you see? In the police court report you find John Smith, for being drunk, is fined $2 or $4, and in default is imprisoned for ten days. The man who made John Smith drunk has nothing whatever done to him. What happens? John Smith's friends get the amount of the fine, and pay it for him, and in a day or two afterwards John Smith is drunk again. He fails to pay the fine this time, and he is sent to jail. Now, the man who made John Smith drunk should be fined $20, Let the clerk of licenses inform every liquor seller in the place, that John Smith has been drunk and fined by the police magistrate, and that no liquor is to be sold to him. After John Smith gets out of jail, at the end of ten days, you may depend upon it, he will find no place where he can obtain liquor. I think the hon. member from Sarnia is just as anxious as I am to put down intemperance, and that he ought to unite with me to procure this legislation. It may be said that the reason why there is no punishment provided under this Act, for the man who buys the liquor, while there is a penalty for selling it, is that the whiskey informer would, in that case, be liable to punishment. Is it worth while to entail serious evils on the country, in order that the whiskey informer may be protected? I think, if there is any rascal in the country less deserving of sympathy or protection, than another, it is the informer employed by the temperance people to ferret out the whiskey sellers. If there is a man who is prepared to commit any crime, except perhaps murder—he would not have the courage for that—it is the whiskey informer. If the hon. member from Sarnia will take me into his confidence and let us work together, we will perhaps secure legislation which will put down intemperance. I possess no longer the vigor of youth, but if the hon. gentleman with his energy, will join with me I will do everything I can to aid him in getting a good license law on the statute book—a law that can be enforced. I do not care for popularity. In my own city, I will make myself as prominent as can be to have those persons who make drunkards severely punished. Take the case we had up on a former occasion—the case of the county of Sunbury, in New Brunswick. There are 1,400 voters in that county, and I think the hon. member from Sarnia will admit that you cannot carry out a law to fine a poor woman $50 for selling a glass of cider, unless the feeling of the people in that county is very strongly in favor of it. Now, out of the 1,400 voters in that county how many took the trouble to vote upon this question? Only 169 pro and con. Can you carry out a very stringent law that has all the atrocities and cruelties of the Scott Act—that makes one law for the poor and another for the rich—that allows the man who has a good cellar and a long purse to keep ten gallons of liquor while the man who cannot buy so much is fined $50 or imprisoned for three months? Is that an Act that commends itself to one's judgment or one that should be carried out? I say no, and I trust

the majority of this committee will echo my sentiments. Therefore, I beg to move :

That the dealing in ales, porter, lager-beer, cider and light wines containing not more than twelve per cent. of alcohol, be exempt from the operation of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878.

HON. MR. DICKEY — If my hon. friend will allow me, I will second that motion. It is not my intention to inflict a speech on the committee at this hour of the evening on that interesting subject. I chiefly rise for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to a letter which I have, bearing upon the question submitted to us by that resolution. It is a letter from a clergyman, and is to this effect: He states that he objects to the Canada Temperance Act—

"Because it is too sweeping and indiscriminating: it not only puts the ban on distilled liquors, but on fermented liquors of the weakest kind, even on lager beer, the lightest wine, etc., and punishes in the most rigorous manner all who will presume to make or sell all such. I ask, is not this a sumptuary law of the most tyrannical kind?"

Then he presents the Scriptural argument. He says :—

"Secondly, I object to it decidedly as not only unscriptural but anti-scriptural. This is to my mind the most serious objection of all; so it must be to any Christian man. It is contrary to the higher law. Clearly wine, properly so called, has the sanction of Scripture for its use. This has been again and again demonstrated; yet this law places a ban on it and punishes the sale of it, and consequently condemns the use of it as if it were poison."

That is doing no injustice, I think, to the argument of gentlemen who are so enthusiastic in support of that principle in this country. Then he goes on to say, after referring to the miracle of Cana in Galilee :—

"Shall we blasphemously dishonor His name by placing under the ban of law what He allowed and sanctioned, and thus in effect say that He did wrong? I am a minister of the Gospel, as my signature will show you, and must maintain my conscientious convictions."

I may say he resides in the Dominion, and is a minister of the gospel, and the hon. gentlemen who support this Bill must take my assertion for that. I have no doubt that this letter will have its due weight with my hon. friends on both sides of the House. The letter concludes as follows :—

"Hoping you will be successful in your resistance to what it false, and in maintaining what is true, I remain, &c."

I wish to call the attention of the hon. member from Sarnia, who has charge of this Bill, to the proceedings which have lately taken place in his own province, Ontario, upon this very subject. It appears that there is a temperance organization there called the National Temperance Union.

HON. MR. VIDAL—An organization of liquor sellers.

HON MR. DICKEY—A challange has been given to them by a sister organization, who work somewhat upon the same lines, but go further and seek for prohibition—in other words, they go for the Scott Act, for it is prohibition, not temperance at all. These extreme men challenged the other men to a discussion, and it is but fair that I should read to the House what is the question at issue between them, because one is a temperance organization, and the other is a prohibition society. We are legislating, now, I hope, in the interest of temperance—that is the great Christian virtue we are called upon to promote. They say :—

"It is not true that 'discussion has been invited at the meetings of the union,' which hitherto have been chiefly intended for organization, and to set forth to the public the various grounds of action upon which the members of the union propose to deal with the great question of intemperance."

That is exactly the line upon which the Church of England Temperance Society works; the pledges are optional, either total abstinence or temperance in the use of liquors. It continues :—

It is not true that the union or its speakers are "opposed to total abstinence as a remedy for drunkenness." Several leading members are total abstainers, and a total abstinence pledge, as well as a moderate pledge, are amongst the methods adopted by the society in combatting intemperance. The union believes that many total abstinence societies have, through ignoring the teachings of experience, science, Scripture and common sense, been led into an extreme and false position. The union bases its advocacy of total abstinence and of temperance on the

firm ground of Scripture warrant and Christian ethics, believing that these cannot be improved upon.

It is not true that we have asserted that "beer and wines have been proven to contribute to national sobriety" any more than that we have stated that tarts and pies have proven to conduce to the prevention of gluttony. We have maintained, however, that the substitution of beer and wine for whiskey tends greatly to diminish intemperance, and that the licensing of the first-named beverages, under due restrictions, and the abolition of the sale of ardent spirits as beverages, is more calculated to diminish intemperance than is total prohibition, which, experience has shown, tends to leave whiskey as the sole alcoholic drink of the people.

I believe that to be perfectly true, in the Scott Act counties particularly.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Very bad, too.

HON. MR. DICKEY—Yes, of the worst quality; but it is much more convenient to carry. A man can smuggle or sell a much larger quantity of what makes a man drunk in that form than in the form of beer or light wines, and I agree with the hon. member from Halifax that there is not much danger of people getting drunk on either of these beverages. The National Temperance Union continues:—

"In reply to the challenge, we beg to say that we assume the following positions:—

(1.) That alcohol is a food, and that while medical testimony, science, and experience show that the use as beverages of ardent spirits is a fruitful cause of intemperance and injurious to the health; the same evidence goes to prove that the use of natural, fermented beverages, such as beer and wine, is not, except in some cases, injurious to the health, and in many instances is beneficial.

(2.) That Scripture and Christianity warrant temperance in the use of wine.

(3.) That the substitution of beer and wines for ardent spirits would greatly reduce drunkenness.

(4.) That total prohibition is not successful.

In support of these propositions we will meet Messrs. W. H. Howland, James Thompson, A. Farley, George Ward, I. Wardell, and James B. Marshall, collectively or individually, in joint meetings as proposed."

I think the mere reading of the proposition which these people lay down, and which runs on all fours with the views, I hope, of the majority of this House, will show that we are proceeding on safe ground when we take the position that my hon. friend has assumed in offering this resolution to the committee. We think that it is in the true interest of temperance—not of prohibition, but of the Christian virtue of temperance; and my hon. friend who talks so much about it being necessary to exclude everything as a beverage in the shape of liquors, and all wines and beers, ought to recollect that really we are making a proposition now which would have the effect of advancing the cause of temperance. If you can get rid of the abuse of ardent spirits, and you could not take a better course than by providing a proper substitute, I think you will advance a step in the right direction towards the end that, I think, we all have in view, which is to put down drunkenness. It is useless to say to the people that they shall not drink certain beverages, because by that you take the very mode to make them do it, constituted as human nature is; but say to them "you will have no further excuse; you can use light wines and beer, and if you think it necessary to take stimulants, you can take the harmless one." In that way, we think, the Scott Act will be materially improved, and on all future occasions it should be passed with that restriction. Under those circumstances, I do hope that the friends of the measure will accept this very reasonable amendment, because I think it is really in the interest of the Act itself, and, without wishing to weary the House, I will conclude by saying I think my hon. friend has taken a very proper course in offering this resolution, and I trust that it will commend itself to the majority of the committee.

HON. MR. WARK—My hon. friend from Amherst says that if we adopt the course recommended by the motion now before the committee, we will be taking a step in the right direction. I can tell my hon. friend that we took that step which is now recommended, 50 years ago. We thought that we were taking a step in the right direction then, but we very soon felt that the use of these weak liquors, those wholesome beverages, was only a stepping stone to the use of stronger liquors. I have known numerous instances of it. It is not at all uncommon, I believe, at the present day for some people to say that every gentleman ought to take his glass of wine, but no gentleman ought to get

drunk. I have known numerous instances of men of that kind who taught their sons to be gentlemen by taking a glass of wine, but the young men did not long confine themselves to such beverage. The wine was not stimulating enough for them, and they resorted to the bar rooms and to stronger liquor, and got to be a disgrace to their families. Take the beer shops in any large town of England, and they are only nurseries to provide customers for the gin palace. Just as sure as these people begin to resort to the beer shops they go on after a while to the gin palace. Consequently, the step which the hon. gentleman talks of taking now, and which was taken 50 years ago, will be found to be a failure. The clergyman from whose letter he has quoted, has no right to speak of every Christian man believing as he does, for we can get 50 or 100 without going out of the province that we are now in, of the highest standing, who differ from him entirely. As to the use of wine, I ask where can you get wholesome wine now? I remember a neighbor of mine telling me that he went and bought a cask of port wine which had just been imported and took it home; and when he opened it he took a pail of logwood chips out of it; yet poor people are recommended to get port wine for the sick members of their families when they are only getting extract of logwood chips. I say let the weaker liquors alone. I do not think it is necessary to discuss this question at length, but I tell the hon. gentleman what my observation has been for 50 years. I have known numerous instances where men commenced with the weaker liquors and the end was ruin.

HON. MR. DEVER—In reply to hon. gentlemen who say there is no such wine now as there was in the days of the Scripture, allow me to differ entirely from such statements. We have just as good wine now, as there ever has been. The same natural laws that enabled them to make wine, are better known to-day, than they ever were before; and here I want to quote from an authority on wines, so that gentlemen who wish to obtain the best that ever has been made, can get them in the following brands, and described as follows:

"Champagne is the king of wines; its intoxicating effects are rapid, but exceedingly transient, and depend partly upon the carbonic acid which is evolved from it, and partly upon the alcohol, which is suspended in this gas, being applied rapidly and extensively to a large surface of the stomach. The idea that champagne produces gout, is sufficiently refuted by the fact that the disease is very little known in the province where the wine is made.

"We often hear those who are most oppressively wise, in their own conceits, attempt to display their wisdom by referring to the small geographical boundaries of the champagne country, and shrewdly deducing therefrom, that not enough of champagne can be made to allow a single bottle to be imported into this country; but, for all that, the species of wine known as champagne, is manufactured all over the south of Europe, of as excellent a quality as that produced in the District of Champagne, and a vast deal of this genuine wine is imported into this country.

"Just as good champagne can be found here as at Rheims, but your only protection is the character of the people, or house where you purchase. Just as good wine can be got in the remotest inland towns of America, as can be had in Paris or Bordeaux. We have tasted as great a variety of the finest wines, in Chicago, as can be found on the continent of Europe; and there is one importing house in New York, who import, on an average, ten thousand baskets a year, of the 'Moet, Chandon' champagnes, which are, perhaps, the finest of all the various brands of champagnes, and thus, in New York, we have the best genuine champagnes that are made in Europe. Of these brands, the 'Grand Imperial,' or 'Green Seal,' is, perhaps, the finest, though many choose the 'Bouzy Cabinet.' The 'Fleur de Bouzy' sells for the same price as the 'Heidsick,' and is a better wine than even this favorite old brand. And if a single house imports ten thousand baskets, yearly, what must be the quantity of genuine champagne which is brought to this country by all the great importing houses? Probably not less than two millions of baskets annually."

So much for hon. gentlemen who state that no good wines can be had in these days.

HON. MR. POWER—I want to know which house my hon. friend recommended?

HON. MR. DEVER—I do not recommend any house; I recommend certain brands, and if the hon. gentleman is acquainted with the wine trade, he will know what I am talking about.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I wish to offer a few observations on the amendment proposed by the hon. member from Halifax. I regret especially that he has

introduced it, because I know that he always speaks according to his convictions and only suggests what he conceives will be in the best interests of society. We all know that arguments can be advanced in favor of the use of beer and light wines, and we all know that those can be used in a rational way without doing injury to the constitution. I have been somewhat surprised that some members of this House, and especially the hon. gentleman from Amherst, have seized the present occasion not merely to object to this Bill, which is simply to make some small amendments to the Temperance Act, but to attack the Temperance Act itself. It is a course which I do not think a wise one for this body to adopt. We know that this Bill, when it was introduced into the House of Commons, was, through the influence of the First Minister, placed upon the notice paper; and through his influence it took precedence of all other questions in order to give it every chance of passing through Parliament. The First Minister and the Government desired to make an impression on the country that they were favorable to the Scott Act, and desired to aid the temperance movement. It appears to me that it places the Senate in a very unfortunate position, that when this Bill comes up here the leaders of the Government and their immediate partisan supporters should be the most prominent to endeavor to destroy not only this amending Act but also the Temperance Act itself. There can be no mistake about the position that they take. We find the Minister of Justice cheering on gentlemen who are pursuing a course, the effect of which must be to destroy entirely the Temperance Act, and to discourage all those who have been promoting the temperance cause throughout the province of Ontario. I cannot speak for the other provinces, but I can speak for Ontario. I do not think that this is a manly or proper course for the First Minister and the Government to pursue. If they really believe that that temperance movement should be discouraged, why did they not, in an honest and manly way, declare so on the floor of the other Chamber, and not leave the odium to fall upon this body as they do, of striking a blow at that movement, which has been inaugurated by the most respected and responsible men of the country? I say that such tactics are most discreditable on the part of the Government. What has influenced me as a Conservative, more than anything else, to take action against the present Administration, is that I have seen them steadily for years, using this august body to serve their party purposes. They seem not to care whether they destroy our good name. They go on using us. They wish us to register their objectionable money grants; and here to-day they go through the farce of impressing the country that they desire to encourage the temperance movement, while they use the Senate to destroy their Bill. Here we have the ministerial supporters and the leaders of this House, through the instrumentality of their friends, supporting a motion, the effect of which must be to destroy entirely the Temperance Act.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—Have they supported it yet?

Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER — They have supported it by their cheering on, and by the speeches which have fallen from them. What will be the result? The First Minister and his colleagues care not one straw if they sink the Senate in public estimation; or whether a cry may be got up to demand its abolition. Those men who have used you will turn upon you afterwards and say that you were foolish, and that you ought to have acted upon your own independent judgment—just as they have brought ruin upon many, and afterwards laughed at those who were the victims of their evil courses, and so they will with regard to the Senate of the Dominion. I was chided in very strong terms last night, because I expressed my views openly, and I desire to say that as long as I have health I shall continue to express those views, and I feel confident that we shall succeed in a very short time in having a Government in power who will act upon more upright principles; who will act in the interest of the people—of the Senate—and of the country at large. It is pitiable to see a Government using this august body, composed of the best men from all parts of the Dominion, for their miserable partisan purposes. I am sure that in a very short time you will come to despise the leaders of the present

Government—that you will look back to the words which I have uttered on the floor of this House, and say that I was right, and that you wished you could only have seen them in the same light that they have appeared to me for the last four years. They are men who are destitute of principle and feeling, and have no consideration whatever for this Chamber or the public interests.

Hon. Mr. CARVELL—I have nothing to say with regard to the closing remarks of the hon. member from Woodstock, but I must confess that I was surprised at his opening sentences. He expressed his very great regret that the junior member for Halifax should have introduced an amendment to promote the use of beer and light wines. It has been my privilege to taste wine in company with the hon. gentleman from Woodstock, and for days and weeks afterwards I have known him to smack his lips over its flavor. There is no hon. gentleman in this Chamber who more thoroughly appreciates a glass of good wine than the hon. gentleman himself; he is a judge of it, and he appreciates it, not only while it is trickling down his throat, but for days and weeks afterwards.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I do not think that this has anything to do with the question before the committee.

Hon. Mr. CARVELL—That is the great trouble in Canada in reference to this question which is now before the House—the Scott Act and its working, its continuance, its repeal, or its amendment. At elections people will advocate the Scott Act, will vote for it, will subscribe liberally to the fund for its enforcement, who from day to day and year to year take their wine, who keep it in their cellars and offer it to their friends. In our own town not long ago, after the Scott Act had been re-enacted in Charlottetown, a friend of mine said that he was prepared to subscribe $1,000 to a fund to enforce that act. If I had gone with my friend who made that statement to his house he would have asked me if I would take wine or ale. Such is the inconsistency even of those who do vote for the Scott Act. There are many men who, while voting for the Temperance Act themselves, indulge, as does my hon. friend opposite, in light wines, an absurd position which I hope not many hon. gentlemen in this House occupy.

Hon. Mr DEVER—The hon. gentleman, while speaking, conveyed to the House every word that I could say in reference to this matter. The hon. member from Woodstock, a few moments ago, declared that he was going to support the Scott Act, and seemed most anxious to find fault with the Government under the supposition that they intend to support adverse amendments to it. I felt that I had no quarrel with the hon. gentleman in his attempts to oppose or find fault, in his own peculiar way, with the members of the Government in this House, or out of the House. In reference to the hon. gentleman's quarrel, or kink against the Government, I have nothing whatever to say; but I did feel with the hon. gentleman who preceded me, the inconsistency of the member from Woodstock in daring to rise and tell this House and the country that he is going to support a temperance measure—a man who is notoriously known to use liquor every day of his life—a man who is known to be under the influence of liquor occasionally—

Hon. Mr. POWER—I rise to a question of order; what has the inconsistency of the member for Woodstock to do with the matter before the House?

Hon. Mr. SMITH—Order, order.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I rise to a question of order. One of our rules forbids sharp, taxing and insulting speeches. This speech is one of that character, and calculated to lead to disorder.

Hon. Mr. SMITH—Order, order.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I have a perfect right to make my point of order. We are now discussing the amendment of my hon. colleague from Halifax to this Bill, to amend the Temperance Act, and any remarks with reference to the taste and habits of the hon. gentleman from Woodstock have not the remotest connection with it.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—It comes with very bad grace from the hon. gentleman

from Halifax to talk of sharp and taxing speeches in connection with the hon. gentleman from Woodstock, as no other gentleman in this House has more disgraced the Senate than the member from Woodstock in that respect.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—I think it would have been more to the point if the hon. member from Halifax had called the hon. gentleman from Woodstock to order when he was speaking; had he done so he would have been in a position to call other gentlemen to order now.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER — Order, order. There is a point of order raised.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The member from St. John was showing the inconsistency of members who vote for this Act, and the difference between precept and example, as illustrated by some gentlemen who, while voting that other people shall not be allowed to use liquor, use it every day themselves. Such hypocrisy should be put down in this House.

HON. GENTLEMEN—Order, order.

THE CHAIRMAN—In a matter of this kind a good deal of latitude is usually allowed, but I hope that hon. gentlemen will refrain from being personal in their remarks.

HON. MR. DEVER—I have nothing but praise for every hon. gentleman who, conscientiously believing that total abstinence from alcohol in any shape or form would be beneficial to everybody, advocates temperance; I have every respect for such men who have a conscientious conviction, and whose lives square with that conviction, and such men in supporting a measure of this kind are entitled to the respect of this House and of the country; but I do hold that it is a bad example for men who use liquor themselves to stand up here and attempt to shackle their equals, if not their betters, and prohibit them from using that which they enjoy themselves.

HON. MR. FLINT—Reference has been made to my course in connection with the Scott Act. I wish to say to the hon. gentleman from Halifax, that I have never voted for the Scott Act, and I have stated here more than once that had I been here when the Scott Act was before this House, I would have voted against it on the ground that it does not go far enough, because I am a total abstainer, and have been one for nearly fifty-eight years, and I am not ashamed to own it; nor am I a crank nor a fanatic. I came to the conclusion to be a total abstainer, on the 19th June 1827, after calm reflection, in the city of Quebec—to touch not, taste not, handle not—and I have endeavored to carry out that principle to the present day, and I intend, God helping me, to carry it out as long as I live. I have never voted for the Scott Act, or any clause in it permitting the sale of liquor. It may be recollected that when the hon. gentleman from Sarnia moved his amendment in reference to allowing liquor to be sold by the pint for medicinal purposes, I voted against him. I vote for no liquor, whether beer, wine, cider, or in any other shape; therefore I shall not vote for the amendment moved by the junior member for Halifax. When my hon. friend from Amherst was speaking in reference to this question, and quoted a letter from a clergyman, I asked him if he could give the name of that clergyman, but my question was not answered. I do not know, nor do I care, who that clergyman may be. He referred to passages in Scripture as permitting the use of liquors, and to the wine that our Saviour made. I would tell the hon. gentleman if they give us such wine today as our Saviour made at Cana of Galilee, I will go for it.

HON. MR. CARVELL—How does the hon. gentleman know what kind of wine it was?

HON. MR. FLINT—I do not go in for stinking, poisonons whiskey mixed with dirty water and logwood, that they call wine; I want the pure juice of the grape, such as our Saviour made, and if I could get that, I would be willing to drink it. The minister, whoever he was, who quoted from that passage of Scripture, knew but little of what he was talking about, and I may say that I have known a great many ministers of that character. I am not at

all backward in giving my views in reference to ministers any more than to anyone else. If the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Halifax is carried, it will destroy the Scott Act, and I think hon. gentlemen should well consider its effects before they vote for it, and whether they are willing to destroy the Temperance Act or not.

HON. MR. ALMON—Do I understand you to say that you would not have voted for the Scott Act had you been here?

HON. MR. FLINT—I have never voted for it, and would not vote for it. I have stated, on more than one occasion on the floor of this House, that had I been here I would have voted against it. If there was nothing else up to-day before us but the Temperance Act, I would not vote for it. My principles are too well known. I have carried them out strictly for too many years to fail now, but I am satisfied that if this amendment carries, the Temperance Act will be destroyed by it, and hon. gentlemen may make up their minds that in another year they will have to contend at once with the movement for total prohibition.

HON. MEMBERS—That is just what we want.

HON. MR. FLINT—The hon. gentleman from Niagara may talk, but I know better; I know which way the hon. gentleman's cat jumps; it very often jumps in the direction of the senior member from Halifax. Now, so far as I am concerned, I wish it to be perfectly understood by hon. gentlemen that I have nailed my colors to the mast; I did so at Quebec more than half a century ago, and I am bound to fight this question till I die. I am no fanatic, but I have seen a great many men who have been in the habit of drinking that have become lunatics, and probably I may see more go in the same direction. The Lord has spared my life for some good purpose; I am past the age of eighty, and I am not going to show the white feather now. I have been led to make those few remarks at this stage of the Bill, but I would not have said a word if the hon member from Halifax had not accused me of voting for the Temperance Act. I did not quite understand the hon. gentleman, his remarks are so indistinct. They are a good deal like chips in porridge, and there are so many chips in the porridge that I cannot separate one from the other. He has a peculiar manner of speaking, and, as a matter of course, constituted as he is, he understands himself, I think, a good deal better than anyone else understands him. I do not wish to take up the time of the House, and I only desire to set myself right on this subject. I will vote for no measure that permits the sale or use of liquor, but I will vote for any amendment that will assist in making the Act we have on our statute books what it ought to be.

HON. MR. ALMON—You will vote for it up to the ten gallons?

HON. MR. FLINT—No, nor one pint either.

HON. MR. THIBEAUDEAU—I am very glad to see that the hon. member from Trent division does not accept any responsibility for the Scott Act, though he is a temperance man, because he must have noticed that the Scott Act has proved to be impracticable, and I believe I can re-echo what the hon. member from Niagara has said. I had an opportunity two years ago of voting against the Act, and I would to-day very willingly vote for its repeal if that were the question before the House. However, as we cannot have the Act repealed, we ought to be very glad to accept the amendment of the hon. gentleman, the junior member from Halifax, because there is no doubt—I cannot speak of the other provinces—but in the province of Quebec the Scott Act would be perfectly impracticable. It has been proved to be so, many times, by the action of our municipal bodies. There was a time in Lower Canada when licenses were actually refused in almost every parish, and it was found out that in such parishes, where licenses were not issued, disorder and drunkenness were greater than ever. Instead of selling liquor openly under license, it was done in hiding places, and sometimes openly on the public markets: it was peddled in broad daylight, and I am quite convinced that in my province wherever the Scott Act is

brought into force, such desorders will recur. This temperance question is one to be promoted by moral teaching rather than by legislation, and in Quebec we have moral influences that will always, in connection with our municipal organizations, control the sale of liquor. Our municipalities grant one or two licenses in a parish, under the belief that such places are absolutely necessary, and that they should be maintained under daily control; and in this way the sale of liquor is regulated. But what does the Scott Act do? It gives permission to all doctors to issue certificates to get liquor whenever they are applied to for it, and who trusts those doctors? Nobody! Once a year the druggists are obliged to file those certificates with the Government, but I hold that that is no check at all on this traffic, and that the control we had before of moral influence, and through the municipal organizations, and through licenses, was much more beneficial and more effective than the control that the Government would have over the druggists and doctors. We are asked also to amend the law in such a way that the doctors themselves may be permitted sell liquors. I believe that if you allow the doctors to issue certificates, it is equivalent to debarring the country people from having liquor at all when they want it for their own use or the use of their families in sickness; because, if you take the province of Quebec, say from Montreal to the city of Quebec, with the exception of Three Rivers, you will not find an apothecary's shop in that whole distance. It cannot be said that the law is a good one that allows a physician to issue certificates for liquor, and the persons who obtain them may have to travel 50 or 90 miles to a drug shop in order to get the liquor. I think the thing is perfectly absurd. If the law is to be enforced upon any country, I believe you cannot do otherwise than permit doctors to sell liquors, and if you allow them to sell liquors, you allow hundreds of people that privilege without any control over them instead of, as we have it to-day, one or two vendors in every parish selling it under license. I am satisfied that I can travel from Montreal to Quebec, and obtain a certificate from every doctor in the district, in my present state of health, for a bottle of wine. For these reasons I will vote for the amendment of the junior member from Halifax.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—It seems inevitable that in discussing any Bill of this kind to amend the Canada Temperance Act, the whole question should come under review. I do not know that it can be avoided, but it is unfortunate that the discussion has taken such a range on this occasion, and has brought out very strongly the feeling that the Scott Act itself has failed to effect the object which its promoters anticipated. When the Act was brought into the House of Commons, I was a member of that body, and I voted against it. I had no hesitation in avowing my hostility to the measure from that time up to now, and my observation of its working, and of the manner in which it has been forced upon the people, and of the general effect of the Act, has only confirmed my previous opinion. We have been told that this amendment, which is now proposed, will destroy the Canada Temperance Act. Well, if it destroys that Act it will destroy a measure which has not effected, up to this time, and is not likely in the future to effect, the object which is claimed for it. I say that the Scott Act is a delusion; it is pretended that it has a moral effect, which it does not have in reality; and though it may, in some cases restrict the use of liquor, it has other effects which are more demoralizing than the use of alcohol itself. Wherever the Scott Act is in operation, it is in force by the will of a minority of the people, and every method will be adopted to evade it. It will introduce habits of fraud, dissimulation and dissipation wherever it goes, as such acts have done in other countries wherever they have been adopted, particularly in the State of Maine. There is a great outcry about the condition of the people of Canada, and the necessity there is for imposing this sumptuary law upon them, because I feel that it is a sumptuary law, notwithstanding the objection of my hon. friend from Sarnia to that epithet. We know that by late statistics it is shown that the people of Canada are less in need of this kind of restrictive legislation than any other civilized people on the face of the earth.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—We have the best record in the world.

HON. MR. PLUMB—In the statistics of the different countries of the world, Canada stands pre-eminent for temperance and moral conduct, and yet we are, by implication, told that it is absolutely necessary to put the Canadian people under a law which is a kind of bondage, and one which every independent man rises in indignation against.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I am as independent as the hon. gentleman, but I do not rise in indignation against it.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is very independent in everything until the Scott Act is under discussion. I maintain that if any legislation is necessary to carry out the machinery of the Scott Act while it stands on our statute book as the law of Parliament, the framers of that Act are entitled to that legislation. They have had that legislation to-day; they have had that section which I objected to, because my hon. friend when he brought his Bill down did not state accurately or exactly what would be the effect of that section, and what was the necessity for it, but I suppose that necessity will be met for the present by the legislation which is now going on in the other House, to suspend the operation of the License Act of 1883, and I now feel perfectly at liberty to vote for any amendment, which may commend itself to my judgment, to the Canada Temperance Act. The hon. gentlemen who are supporting the Scott Act, have brought it on themselves. They brought this Bill here; they brought up the discussion on the Scott Act; the amendment would never have been brought up as an affirmative proposition by those who oppose the Act; but the temperance people bring in a Bill here with nine sections, eight of which are confessedly padding for the purpose of carrying the other section, and we are not told its force, but that that section is an absolute necessity towards the working of the Act. Now, any other amendments are in order, and the hon. gentleman who is in charge of this Bill, is, with his friends, to blame for having put the Act in that position. Their Act is on trial, and I tell the hon. gentleman that just so long as the Scott Act is forced upon the community by a minority vote, just so long will it meet with this kind of opposition and this kind of legislation from those who are not terrified by the bugbear that this temperance movement is sweeping over the country in such a wave that any man who dares to oppose it is likely to suffer in his political position, as well as in the estimation of the country. I am not afraid of the Scott Act; I will take the consequences of opposing it. I never knew any enthusiasm of this kind that has not run its course as this will. I say to-day that I am prepared to vote for prohibition pure and simple. This Act was so ingeniously devised that it never was intended to be a Prohibition Act. The principle of it is local option, and local option has never succeeded in any country where it has been tried. It was announced by its promoters that the Scott Act would bring about a great revolution in the habits of the people. There is no necessity for discussing the evil effects of intemperance; but because one man is injured by drink, is that any reason why 100 men should be put under bonds? Why should it be necessary, because one man shoots off his hands with a fowling piece, that the lock should be taken off every gun in the country? It is no argument on which to support the Scott Act, and I shall vote with great pleasure for the amendment which is offered by the junior member for Halifax.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Like my hon. friend opposite me, I do think that the discussion which has taken place in connection with this Bill has been exceedingly out of place, and not properly connected with the matter brought under consideration by the Bill on which we are to form a judgment. I am quite well aware that in my opening remarks on introducing this Bill I have been accused of opening up the whole question of temperance legislation; I say, however, that I have carefully avoided doing anything of the kind; I have gone carefully over the report of my speech, and I challenge hon. gentlemen to show from the first to the last of it that there is anything in my remarks opening up the general question of the principles and results of the Canada Temperance Act. I tried to show that because the Scott Act had been so largely adopted, and by such overwhelm-

ing majorities in the counties where it has been voted on, therefore we ought to pass these amendments which are required to make it operative. I said nothing which might not have applied equally well to an insurance bill or a bill on any other subject as to the Canada Temperance Act. But no sooner did I close my lips, than I was followed by gentlemen who launched at once into the great subject of temperance legislation, denouncing all its advocates as hypocrites and fanatics, or as being exceedingly ignorant of the requirements of the country, with being despotic, and forcing our legislation on an unwilling people. The utter absurdity of such a statement is so palpable that it puzzles me how any person can be found bold enough to make it in this House. As it is a measure which can only be adopted by the majority of the people expressing their will by the ballot, it cannot possibly be forced on an unwilling people. In what other way can you get the expression of the will of the people on any question that may be submitted to them?

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—It has never had a majority in its favor in any county.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—Admitting for argument sake that it has never had a majority of the people in its favor; has the hon. gentleman from Niagara ever had a majority of the electoral vote in his own election? I think not. Examine the election returns of the House of Commons to-day, and see how few members have been elected by the vote of the majority in the constituencies they represent. You will find that only twelve of them, outside of those who were elected by acclamation, have polled a majority vote.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—This is an entirely dissimilar subject.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—I mean to say that under the British Constitution under which we live, the only possible mode by which we can rightly ascertain the will of the people on any question is by vote of ballot, where every man may, and generally does, vote according to his own convictions, and without coercion, because it is not known how he votes. He may vote contrary to the wishes of his employer, or his friends or his relatives, but he votes according to his own convictions as to what is right. I therefore hold that we have with reference to the places where this Act has been adopted, an honest expression of the majority of the electors of each of those constituencies.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—If you had, they have no right to tell us what we shall eat and drink.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—It is true that the whole electoral vote is not polled; but what are we to infer from that? Are we to infer that every one who does not come out to vote is opposed to this legislation? I can with equal justice take the opposite ground and assert that every one that does not come out to vote is in favor of the Act instead of against it, and I have as good a right to say that, as the hon. gentleman has to say to the contrary. There is no other way by which the will of the people can be ascertained than by open, honest vote by ballot, where every man expresses his honest convictions in a way that nobody can interfere with or punish him for it.

I will now notice a word that the hon. gentleman from Niagara has used on several occasions, very improperly calling the Temperance Act a sumptuary law. If some blatant stump orator were addressing a crowd, and either ignorant himself or presuming on the ignorance of his audience, had called the Scott Act a sumptuary law, it would not surprise me; but to hear a gentleman of the acknowledged erudition and of the high literary attainments of the hon. gentleman from Niagara, who is well acquainted with the language from which the word is derived—to hear him attach such an opprobious epithet to the Canada Temperance Act is to me entirely incomprehensible, as in my judgement it is an entire departure from a just appreciation of the meaning and proper application of that word. What does it mean?

Hon. Mr. DEVER—It means regulating the price of our food?

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—Sumptuary laws are laws to regulate the expenditure and

prevent extravagance of the people in food or dress or anything of the kind.

HON. MR. DICKEY—There is nothing about drink in it.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It is the commonly accepted word.

HON. MR. VIDAL—It is not used in that sense by men of intelligence who aim to speak correctly and who wish to secure a correct interpretation of their words. I will refresh the hon. gentleman's memory by referring to some of the authorities and we shall see if his interpretation is sustained by them.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—What work is that?

HON. MR. VIDAL—The work I now refer to is Chambers' Encyclopedia. It tells us what sumptuary laws are, and what they have been in olden times, that they existed under ancient dispensations, and how they were used.

HON. MR. PLUMB—They were laws to regulate the habits of the people.

HON. MR. VIDAL—They were no such thing. Chambers says :—

> Sumptuary Laws—laws passed to prevent extravagance in banquets, dress and private expenditure. They abound in ancient legislation. * * * * *
>
> The Lex Orchia, 161 B.C., limited the number of guests to be present at a feast; the Lex Fannia, 161 B.C., regulated the cost of entertainments, enacting that the utmost sum which should be invested on certain festivals, was to be 100 asses, 30 asses on certain other festivals, and 10 asses on an ordinary entertainment, where, also, no other fowl than 1 hen was permitted to be served up, and that not fattened for the purpose. * *
>
> Sumptuary Laws were in great favor in the legislation of England, from the time of Edward III. down to the Reformation. Statute 10, Edward III., cap 3 narrates, that "through the excessive and over-many costly meats which the people of this realm have used more than elsewhere, many mischiefs have happened; for the great men by these excesses have been so grieved, and the lesser people, who only endeavor to imitate the great ones in such sorts of meat, are much impoverished, whereby, they are not able to aid themselves, nor their liege lord in time of need, as they ought, and many other evils have happened as well to their souls as their bodies;" and enacts that no man, of whatever condition or estate, shall be allowed more than two courses at dinner or supper, or more than two kinds of food in each course, except on the principal festivals of the year, when three courses at the utmost are to be allowed. All who did not enjoy a free estate of £100 per annum, were prohibited from wearing furs, skins or silk, and the use of foreign cloth was allowed to the royal family alone. * * * *
>
> Sumptuary Laws continued to be introduced in England in the 16th, and in France as late as the 17th centuries. Scotland had also a similar class of statutes. The Scottish Parliament attempted to regulate the dress of the ladies, to save the purses of the puir gentlemen, their husbands and fathers. There was a prohibition against their coming to kirk or market with the face muffled in a veil; and statutes were passed against superfluous banqueting, and the inordinate use of foreign spices, "brocht from the pairts beyond the sea, and sauld at dear prices to monie folks that are very unabill to sustain that coaste."

These laws were made with the acknowledged and professed sole object of preventing extravagance on the part of those who, it was thought, were indulging in luxuries beyond their means and unwisely expending their money. We do not, by our law, interfere with anybody's eating and drinking or clothing. The hon. gentleman from Niagara may lay in tuns of wine if he likes, even if the Scott Act should be adopted in his county. The idea of the law is not a sumptuary idea; it is not for the purpose of preventing extravagance on the part of the people; it is for the purpose of preventing crime, pauperism and misery. It is a measure of police, of public safety, required for the public good, and has nothing whatever to do with sumptuary legislation.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Why is the hon. gentleman so sensitive about that word?

HON MR. VIDAL—Does the hon. gentleman know the meaning of the word sensitive? if so, he misapplies it, for I am not at all sensitive about the term.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The Senate will judge whether the hon. gentleman is sensitive on that point or not.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The hon. gentleman professes to speak as a man of observation; he tells us of the evils that he has

seen resulting from the adoption of the Scott Act. Where has the hon. gentleman seen it in operation? To what places have his observations extended? In what part of the country has he had an opportunity of personally making this investigation? Does the hon. gentleman know that only in one county of Ontario has this Act been in force? and in that county we have the most abundant and incontrovertible testimony, proving that the law has accomplished everything that could be reasonably expected of it. Surrounded as it is by other counties in which liquors are freely sold under license, this county has retained its integrity and enforced the law: on two occasions it has given evidence of its satisfaction with this law by upholding it at the polls.

HON. MR. PLUMB—There are more liquors drunk there now than there ever were before.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Where does the hon. gentleman get his information? It is just one of those reckless statements which flow from his lips on this question, without any foundation whatever. I challenge the hon. gentleman again, to name any one place where he has had an opportunity of observing the operation of this law, and that to his knowledge it has failed in its operation.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Every body knows that it has failed in the State of Maine.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Everybody knows that it has *not* failed in the State of Maine. Everybody knows that, so far from finding any dissatisfaction with the prohibition legislation, the people of Maine have recently made prohibition a part of the constitution of the State. To assert that the people of that State, who have had thirty years' experience of the operation of their prohibitory law, have not enough intelligence to know whether it is beneficial for the State, is utter balderdash.

HON. MR. PLUMB—What is balderdash?

HON. MR. VIDAL—There is a dictionary and the hon. gentleman can find out for himself. If it were right to take up the time of this House, I could give statistics and information on the effect of prohibition that could not be gainsaid; I could show that wherever this accursed traffic has been effectively prohibited either in Britain or America, there has resulted peace, freedom from crime and diminution of misery and poverty, such as the advocates of temperance have claimed would follow its suppression. The hon. gentleman from Amherst has read us a letter from a clergyman. What a tremendously important thing it is to have a letter from a clergyman to tell us about wine and its goodness, to inform us what a bad thing the Scott Act is, and its utter failure! If the utterances of clergymen are of any value on this question—and I regard them as specially valuable—I have here before me the utterance not of one man, who, for all I know, may be a tippler himself and strongly inclined to favor the liquor traffic, but the statements of the ministers and gentlemen who formed the 10th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, at its session last year. I am not giving the testimony of some unknown man claiming to be a Minister of the Gospel; I am giving the testimony of men who occupy the highest place in the country, both in intelligence, in social position, and in connection with the Church. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada is a body consisting of about 400 members, 200 of which are ministers, and 200 elders—people who have been selected in their congregations as being men of experience and judgment, and qualified to discharge aright the duties of rulers of the Church, and what does that court say?—

"That, in view of the present aspect of the temperance movement throughout the land, the General Assembly adopt the following as the deliverance on this matter:—

"1. That we regard the traffic in strong drink as one of the greatest hindrances to the progress of the cause and kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Now, these are not ignorant men. These are not fanatics, who speak because they have a mere prejudice against drinking. These are highly educated men, who have been through the universities; men of large experience and information, and many of them occupying high positions in this Dominion. They continue:—

"2. That in view of the evils wrought by this scourge of our race, this Assembly would hail with gladness the utter extermination of the traffic in intoxicating liquor as a beverage, by the power of example, public opinion, and the strong arm of the law.

"3. That we rejoice at the wonderful advancement of temperance and prohibition sentiments throughout the world, and especially in our own land; and would recommend our people by voice, vote and example, and by all peaceful and righteous means to work for the abolition of this great evil.

"4. That we re-assert our approval of the principles of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, and recommend the adoption of the said Act, as the best available means for the legal suppression of the traffic."

And yet we are told that public sentiment is against this Act; that the people regard it as a failure. I think that those who say so must have a very low estimation indeed of such a talented and influential body as the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, when they can count such testimony as nothing. But other churches have given the same testimony, have just as emphatically recorded their approval of the Temperance Act of 1878, and have recommended its adoption by those who are under their spiritual guidance. Now, what question have we before us? What is our duty as Senators in reference to this matter? The hon. gentleman from Niagara, and other speakers, have admitted that the Bill, as far as it is necessary for the operation of the law on the statute book, ought to pass. He has misrepresented my view in alluding to my remarks on the clause to which he referred, because I distinctly stated in directing the attention of the House to it, that it was the most important section of the Bill, and explained why it was so. I might have done it more fully, but I did not think it was necessary then, and subsequently I was prepared to do so in reply to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Amherst, on introducing his amendment, but the withdrawal of the amendment made it unnecessary. Who is it that has asked for this Bill? I have no personal interest in it. It did not originate with me. I am merely the medium by which it is presented and recommended to this House. The Bill has come to us from the representatives of the people. It may be all very well for some hon. gentlemen to seek to belittle the petitions which have been presented to this House on this subject, but I tell them that 767 petitions from all parts of the Dominion have been presented to Parliament this session, praying that we shall pass no legislation calculated to lessen the prohibitory character of the Temperance Act, or to render it more difficult of adoption or enforcement. What is this amedment that is now proposed to the Bill? Is it not a direct and unreasonable denial to the prayer of those 767 petitions, representing as they do over 100,000 of our people? It is alleged by an hon. member that some of the signatures to the petitions are written in one hand, or by women and children; that may possibly be the case in some few instances; I only know that all the numerous petitions that have passed through my hands have apparently been properly signed, and the majority of them have borne the names of Ministers of the Gospel and of many men whose position in society in the parts of the country in which they were signed, entitles them to respectful attention. It is not, as the junior member for Halifax has said, the province of Ontario only that has sent in petitions; he himself has presented several from his own province.

HON. MR. ALMON—They all came from Toronto to me.

HON. MR. VIDAL—They came originally from Nova Scotia. Were they not petitions from Nova Scotia, from the hon. gentleman's own province?

HON. MR. ALMON—Yes, but they were sent to me from Toronto, which seems to be the great emporium for them.

HON. MR. VIDAL—They were first sent to the Secretary of the Dominion Alliance, to be by him transmitted to the representatives, in Parliament, of the different constituencies from which they came. I assert, with confidence, that all parts of the Dominion are now looking to this House, with intense anxiety, and watching with deepest interest our action to-night, and most fatal would it be to the influential position which this House holds, and to the respect now accorded to it in the country at large, if, when the temperance people are asking for some slight amendments to the Scott Act, ad-

vantage is taken in a most unmanly way, in a way that is not consistent with the dignity or character of this House, to destroy that Act by this amendment.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Oh, oh, oh! Order!

HON. MR. VIDAL—If my remarks are out of order, I will withdraw them; but I see similar remarks were made without exception being taken, by the senior member from Halifax, last year, when he said, speaking of an amendment of this kind: "I should say that those hon. gentlemen, in attacking the principle of the Scott Act under cover of this Bill, are not acting consistently with their professions of manliness; for this amendment is certainly an attack on the principles of the Canada Temperance Act, and it is not made in what I regard as a manly or a straightforward way." No fault was found with him; why should I be censured now? I ask, hon. gentlemen, is it fair? Is it honorable to deal thus with the Scott Act? Here is a Bill to facilitate the operation of that Act, and to cure some defects that have been found in it—and what is this amendment of the hon. gentleman from Halifax intended for? It is obviously intended to destroy the very Act which it professes to amend, and it is so regarded by every person who takes an interest in this great question.

HON. MR. ALMON—To make it more perfect.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I contend—and I speak in the name of 128,000 people who have voted for the adoption of the Scott Act—that the public do not want any such amendment to it.

HON. MR. ALMON—I think that every one of those petitioners in their petitions pray not for the Scott Act, but that an Act should be passed prohibiting the use of liquor altogether, which is quite contrary to the 10-gallon Act, that we have before us.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The hon. gentleman has evidently never looked at the petitions: if he had he would have seen that the first and principal part of the petition prays that no alteration be made in the Canada Temperance Act 1878, lessening its prohibitory character or making it more difficult of adoption or enforcement. Then it closes with the other prayer, which is the end that we are all aiming at. We do not want to conceal it; our openly avowed aim is total prohibition of the liquor tariff; but we accepted the Scott Act as being the best measure we could get, and opening a way by which total prohibition might be eventually obtained. The work is progressing gradually; by degrees, county after county is adopting the Act and becoming accustomed to its restrictions and to the loss of revenue from licenses, and thus the way is being prepared for total prohibition. In my opinion, this is a better way to test the views of the people of this country, than it would be to bring in an absolutely prohibitory law at once. The House of Commons has not been elected on that question, and it would scarcely feel competent to vote upon it, and to claim that they really reflect the opinions of their constituencies thereon. I think the course adopted by the temperance people is a wise course, and if this amendment is passed to-night, this House is setting itself in direct opposition, not only to the plainly expressed opinion of the 128,000 electors who have voted for the Scott Act, but also to the wishes of the whole people as conveyed to us by their representatives in the House of Commons, who have sent this Bill to us. The question involved in the proposed amendment was brought before the House of Commons by Mr. Gigault, in Bill 112, to declare that ale and beer and light wines shall be considered temperance drinks, and shall not be brought under the operation of this Act; but the House of Commons decidedly voted it down, and what is the expectation of hon. gentlemen in adding on this amendment to this Bill? It will have to go to the House of Commons for concurrence, and that House has already given its decisions on this question during the present session, and it cannot be brought forward the second time to be voted upon.

HON. MR. ALMON—I doubt if that is the rule.

HON. MR. VIDAL—It strikes me that it is an opinion very much in harmony with one we have had recently before us; the House of Commons has most emphatically told us by their action that they will not pass such legistation. If we were now introducing the Canada Temperance Act for the first time, I could understand these arguments being advanced, and this vehement opposition manifested; but I cannot understand the opposition to this Bill under the present circumstances, and the pressing of this amendment after the whole country has petitioned us not to make such changes. On what ground can we justify the course which we take in amending this Act contrary to the express desire of the vast majority, I may say the electors of this country? We cannot justify it. We must confess that we are allowing our own personal, private and preconceived opinions to influence us in this matter, if we so disregard all the petitions that have been presented to us praying that no such change may be made in the Act. We shall in effect say we utterly disregard all these prayers, and choose in our imaginary superlative wisdom to set ourselves in opposition to the clearly expressed wish of the people of Canada. It is utterly impossible that such opposition can finally succeed in a constitutionally governed country, as ours is. The voice of the people will be heard, and will be heard in unmistakable tones, and the day will surely, and I believe early, arrive, when this House will recognize it to be not only its duty but its pleasure, to meet the views of the people on this vital question, and to sanction a measure calculated to promote the best interests of the country, and to largely reduce the misery, poverty, crime and disease, which are found in our land, through the prevalence of this great curse of intemperance. I know that it does not prevail to the same extent in this country as it does in some other countries, but, do the hon. gentlemen who are opposing us, and who mention this fact, take credit to themselves for this satisfactory state of things? It is due neither to their example nor their influence, but to men like the hon. gentleman from Belleville (Mr Flint), who, for over fifty years, by precept and example, and by unceasing effort to rescue the intemperate, and to shield the young from temptation—to such as he, the country is largely indebted for the prevalence of sobriety and industry among our people. The Bill before us may, in some respects, be considered an unimportant one, but in view of the results of our dealing with it, and of the effect which the passing of this amendment would have on the Temperance Act of 1878, as being entirely destructive of it, I trust that the House will act with calm judgment and will not set itself in opposition to the plainly expressed wish of the people, to have that Act passed unimpaired.

HON. MR. ODELL—I rise to express my approbation of the motion made by the junior member from Halifax, and I do so because I believe it is in the interests of the majority of the people of this country, and I believe also that it will restore to them some little degree of free action which, under the present law, they are deprived of. We have these applications year by year, from an arbitrary and despotic minority—I say it advisedly—and we have been asked to give them a little more time. The question came up last year and we gave them a little more time; we have given them another year and we were told that it this were done the Act would work well, and that was all they would ask for. I want to draw attention to the mode in which this matter was brought before us last year. The hon. gentleman from Sarnia told us then that they had a caucus, that they had gone to the Government and persuaded them—how I do not exactly know—to take charge of the Bill that was to be brought before Parliament. That Bill was brought here and the influence of the Government was used, so far as they could use it, to press that measure through this Chamber, as the hon. gentleman told us, without any amendment whatever, but when this House insisted upon an amendment he found that the Government were divided upon it. However, that Bill was passed. I thought then there would be an end of it for some time at least. However, here it is now again before us, and what they ask for is further facilities to carry this, what I call oppressive, measure into operation.

The hon. member from Sarnia depre-

cates our going into the question of the Canada Temperance Act at all. But he forgets that he himself brought it before this House in his opening speech, and undertook to tell us how the votes had been taken in the several counties where the Act has been put in force. I would call your attention to the very title of the Bill. It is "An Act to amend the Canada Temperance Act," and that very title brings the whole matter before us. The hon. member told us in his opening speech that all the temperance people wanted was a little oil thrown upon wheels. Has not the whole of this day been taken up in pouring oil on them?

HON. MR. VIDAL—No.

HON. MR. ODELL—Then we had better repeal the sections that have been passed. He asks that proof of an order-in-council be not required, because, he says, it is not a very easy thing, in remote sections of the country, to furnish such proof. We give that, but he wants us to go on throwing oil on the machinery of the Act, and what is the consequence? If you recollect, in the early part of to-day's sitting, instead of the oil allaying the waves at all it rather increased them, because there was a good deal of excitement on the part of the hon. member from Sarnia, and that produced a little of the same sort on the part of other people.

HON. MR. VIDAL—That was the other people throwing gravel in.

HON. MR. ODELL—Then the hon. member, though he will not allow any one to partake of light wines and beer, requires an immense quantity of stimulant himself to keep the machinery in motion. This very session the same influence as last year was attempted to be brought into the House, when the hon. member told us that they had another caucus and had got the First Minister to assure them that their Bill was all right. They introduced their Bill in the other Chamber, and whether through the influence of the Premier or not I cannot say, but the Bill was there passed and that ought to have satisfied him. What does he do now? He brings up this fact to influence us and urges that because the First Minister took charge of it there, we ought to be guided by the views of that House. He will not allow us to have any free opinions of our own. He tells us that because it passed the House of Commons, therefore we should pass it. What are we here for? The question arose the other day whether we are to be a mere recording House for what takes place at the other end of this building, and now an attempt is again made to influence us in our vote on this occosion—that because the House of Commons chose to pass this Bill it is our duty to pass it and send it back without amendment. Now, I do not subscribe to any such doctrine. The hon. member from Ottawa, who I am sorry to observe is not in his place, told us last year, and reiterated the point that I have alluded to just now, that all they wanted was a little more time, admitted if you recollect in his speech to-day that this Act was not working well, that it was to a certain extent a failure, and that he wanted to have it kept upon the statute book until the present generation passed away, and he could educate the rising generation up to the law and then perhaps he would be satisfied. I had intended to make some remarks upon petitions, but the hon. member from Sarnia, when he was told that those petitions all emanated from Ontario, or Toronto, answered that they came from the different sections of the country to Ontario. I have had some of those petitions handed to me to present and I did present some, but others I did not present, because I was satisfied they were not genuine. I was satisfied from the fact that nearly all the names were written with one hand and with one pencil and that evidently the names of every member of the family down to the youngest child were appended, that they were not genuine, and therefore I declined to present them. I handed them to another member and he was satisfied to present them. I say that every member who presents a petition here is to a certain extent responsible for its character, and should see that it is strictly in order. There was nothing on any of the petitions to inform me where they came from except a pencil memorandum made evidently by the person who had forwarded them from Toronto. On the back I would find "from so and so," naming some place in New Brunswick.

That was the only information I had and there was nothing else to show whether they were genuine or not. Some of the observations which I had intended to make on these petitions have been made by another hon. gentleman and, therefore, I will not refer to them any longer. With reference to the question of a little oil for the machinery of this Act, there is one point that I want to make to show what oil will be asked for and what is aimed at. This is what took place in the other branch of Parliament :—

"MR. MCCRANEY enquired whether or not it was the intention of the Government to see that the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act are enforced in counties where adopted, and to provide funds, and to whom entrusted, to pay the inspector, prosecuting attorney and other officers, and from what source are the funds to be taken?

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—The Government will carry out all obligations imposed upon them by the Canada Temperance Act, whatever those obligations may be."

I do not think they gained much by the answer, but I quote that to show what the intentions of this minority are as to forcing their Act upon us. The hon. member from Sarnia, in his opening speech, quoted a large number of figures to show us what the vote upon this Temperance Act had been in Ontario; but he did it, I think, in a very unfair way. He drew no comparison; he did not tell us what the number of votes on the lists were; he did not tell us the population in each of the districts, and though the figures he quoted were large, and one would almost suppose they formed a large majority, yet when the hon. gentleman from Niagara undertook to answer him, he produced figures which entirely annihilated those of the hon. member from Sarnia. Now, the hon. member has challenged anyone to show that this Act has been a failure in any locality. I accept that challenge to a certain extent, and before I sit down I will quote some figures which I think will satisfy the House, that at any rate in the Maritime Provinces this Act is a perfect failure. I happen to have a carefully compiled statement with reference to the Maritime Provinces, shewing the votes for the petition, the aggregate number of votes on the voters' roll, and the total population in each of the counties, and I would ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes while I read these figures. I may say that this statement has been published for some considerable time, and to this day I have never seen or heard of any contradiction with regard to a single figure of it. The following figures, taken from quarters in which the Scott Act has made the greatest "progress," show to what extent "the people" have spoken on the subject :—

NEW BRUNSWICK.

Co. or City.	Votes for Petition.	Aggregate No. of voters on roll.	Total Pop.
Fredericton	403	788	6,218
York	1,229	3,483	20,179
Carleton	1,215	2,913	23,365
Charlotte	867	4,220	26,087
Albert	718	2,300	12,329
Kings	798	4,499	25,617
Queens	315	2,579	14,017
Westmoreland	1,082	5,753	37,719
Northumberland	875	3,321	25,109
Sunbury	176	1,369	6,651
Total	7,678	32,226	201,291

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Co. or City.	Votes for Petition.	Aggregate No. of voters on roll.	Total Pop.
Prince	1,762	5,434	34,347
Charlottetown	827	1,829	11,485
Kings	1,076	5,673	26,433
Queens	1,317	6,351	36,626
Total	4,982	19,287	108,892

NOVA SCOTIA.

Co. or City.	Votes for Petition.	Aggregate No. of Voters on roll.	Total Pop.
Digby	944	2,802	19,881
Queens	763	1,574	10,577
Shelbourne	807	2,266	14,913
Colchester	1,418	4,147	26,720
Annapolis	1,111	3,205	20,598
Kings	1,478	3,431	23,469
Hants	1,082	3,642	23,359
Pictou	1,555	5,780	35,535
Cape Breton	739	3,656	31,258
Inverness	960	3,546	25,651
Cumberland	1,560	4,653	27,368
Yarmouth	1,287	3,361	21,284
Total	13,704	42,063	280,613

The three provinces named are claimed as Scott Act "strongholds." It will be noticed, then, that in these "strongholds" 7,678 New Brunswickers acted in the name of "the people," numbering 201,291; 4,982 Prince Edward Islanders acted in the name of "the people," numbering 108,891; while 13,704 Nova Scotians call themselves "the people," numbering 280,613 persons, or a total of

26,364 Scott Act voters profess to represent "the people," numbering 590,795 persons. Is it remarkable that the 590,795 persons decline to bow down and worship the 26,364?

Now, I think these figures clearly prove that instead of the promoters of the Scott Act having a majority, they are in a very decided minority throughout the country. Having spent so much time in reading these statistics, I will not detain the House longer in commenting upon them. I think they speak for themselves. Now, I want to draw attention to another point. We have been told that it is impossible to show any locality where this Act has been a failure. I have here some figures which were put in my hands, and which come from a source in which I have implicit reliance. They show the amount of money which has been spent within the last three years for the importation of liquor into the city of Fredericton, where, as I believe, the Act was first voted upon and carried, and where it has been voted upon a second time. This statement is for the last three years. The value of liquor imported into Fredericton from St. John alone, irrespective of Montreal and other places, for the last three years, was $123,000. If you divide that by three you get $41,000 as the annual amount for the last three years expended for liquor in that small place, with a population of 6,212 souls. If you take from this population 3,314 females—and I think I have a perfect right to do that because the females are not those who are in the habit of using strong liquor—it leaves 2,904 males, including adults and children. From that I take the males under the head in the population returns of children, 1,906, and that leaves only 998 adult males out of the whole population of that small place. Call it 1,000, and you have got to divide the $41,000 by 1,000; that leaves $41 per head for every adult male in the place. Now, Fredericton is a city where the Scott Act has been voted upon twice, and where it is supposed to be in operation, and from these figures, which I believe are perfectly reliable, it appears that $41 per head for every adult male is expended for liquor in that place alone. I think that is another proof that the Scott Act, in that locality, at all events, is a perfect failure, and the figures speak for themselves. I will notice another thing with regard to that same place. Before the Scott Act came into operation we had no police whatever; they were not required; but now we have got four or five, and really to carry out their duties properly they ought to have four or five more. Not only that, but there is another point connected with it to which I will direct the attention of the House. This Act is, in my opinion, educating the rising generation to intemperance and also in demoralization, in evasion of law and order, and in fostering malice and resistance to constituted authority, and in many cases destroying family harmony. That I know to be the case there. There is another proof—that at this very mo there are several young persons who are undergoing imprisonment in the penitentiary for resisting with firearms the constables there, in the discharge of their duty under this Scott Act, and severely wounding one of these constables. That is another fact which substantiates my statement with regard to the mode in which it is educating the rising generation. Previous to the passing of this Act, when the temperance movement was first made, I, among a great many others who are now opposing it, was favorable to all that they were then doing, and I would say now that if they would continue the course that was adopted in the first instance and lay aside all their temptations to become a political party and over-ride the country and destroy every man's freedom, and if they would by preaching, if you please, by precept and by example, use all their influence to promote temperance, great good could be done; but they should avoid on every account whatever coercion which will only breed resistance. We all know very well that good and evil have been placed before us. That has been ever since the day of man's creation, and so it will continue to the end of time, and if we choose the one and reject the other, there is some merit in it and great good will follow, but if you attempt by coercion to make people moral, you will assuredly fail. You have tried it with regard to crimes of all descriptions, and you cannot make people moral by an Act of Parliament; but I say, let a stringent License Act be passed; punish the drunkard, and the man who makes him drunk, severely; cary out some legislation of that character,

and then you will have the whole country with you, from one end of the Dominion to the other; but I would say to this Chamber that we should rise above party prejudices and the influences of a despotic oligarchy, banded together to rule the country and destroy liberty of conscience. I hope, by the vote taken on this question, this will be the course that we shall pursue. I regret that I have detained the House so long with what has been a dry affair in quoting so many figures, but I felt that they gave great strength to my argument, and I hope that they have had some effect on the House itself.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I do not propose to detain the House long, but it must have been observed that I have been silent during this debate. I have been silent because at the opening I intimated to my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House that I intended to do as I have done on previous occasions, support their amendments and give their Bill every chance; that it should not fail for want of any support which I could give it, but I carefully guarded against anyone entertaining the idea that I approved of the Bill or of its principle in any way. I do not know that I would have risen now, were it not for the purpose of commenting shortly on some of the arguments—fallacies, I deem them—which fell from the hon. member from Sarnia. I can understand how it is, if he addresses temperance audiences in that style, that their minds are carried away by the fallacies which he puts before them. Those fallacies are boldly spoken in public and the antidotes—such antidotes as have just been applied by my hon. friend from Rockwood—are never heard in those audiences at all. The result is, that a sort of unanimity prevails in the temperance communities, on this subject. It is because only one side is put before them by such earnest men as my hon. friend from Sarnia, who, I am sorry to see, is not in his place now. The hon. gentleman said he spoke the voice of the people, and he quoted an axiom that majorities should govern. Well, I am not aware that that is an invariable principle in enacting laws. On the contrary, I think, when a legislature attempts to enact laws, it is not actuated by what the people for whom it is about to legislate, desire, but what is necessary for them. For instance, in passing a law that is intended to restrain some crime or vice, you do not consider what the people it is intended to restrain think, but what is best calculated to attain your object. But a contrary principle is adopted in this law. What is called the optional principle is allowed to prevail, and, as a consequence, the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, is put forward and carried without difficulty, in many places where the people are emphatically sober, but it is not the case if a community is composed of a majority who are given to the vice of intemperance, though that is just the community where the restraining power of such a law is most required. In such a community it is simply inoperative. Now, that such is the case, is proved by instances known to almost every one of us. We have seen the law go into operation; we have seen it disregarded. I hold, in my hand, a report showing the liquor sold in Prince County, Prince Edward Island. In these numerous instances of liquor sold under this law, I say every one which is not simply a case where it has been sold for medicinal purposes, is an infraction of the law. Let hon. gentlemen consider, for a moment, the result of that. This was the easiest and most ready way of obtaining liquor in a county where the Scott Act was in force. No difficulty was found in obtaining it in this county in the usual way, through the apothecary shops; but suppose, by amending this so-called Temperance Act, you made it impossible for men to obtain liquor through this means, what is the consequence? Other and more objectionable means would be taken. That would be the result immediately. Instead of liquor being legally sold by chemists, you would have an organization of smugglers all around our coasts, and they would be supported by false swearing, and would have to be restrained. The attempt would be futile; but still you would have to attempt to restrain them by all sorts of revenue laws and coastguards and cruisers, such as we had in the Old Country fifty years ago. I think Canada is not prepared for that, particularly when the temperance cause was steadily advancing by means not as objectionable as the means

provided by this Act. I may say that I have been living now for three and a half months in this city of Ottawa, in a large hotel, where there is a bar and liquors are sold, and I may say here that I have not seen one offensively drunken man or person in this city during the three and a half months of my residence here. Will any gentleman pretend to assert that, under these circumstances, such a law as this is necessary? Certainly it is not. The hon. gentleman read us an article about sumptuary laws. I will take the liberty of reading a short extract from another encyclopedia, and it seems to me that the extract I am about to read is more weighty, and, I think, will prove more convincing to the House than that which was read by the hon. gentleman. This article is taken from Johnson's new encyclopedia, which I find in the Library. The extract is as follows:—

"Sumptuary laws are laws to restrict the expenses of citizens; they have respect to certain articles of consumption within defined limits.

"Such laws involve always an abridgement of individual liberty, and of the natural right of every man to do what he will with his own—provided he works no wrong or ill to his neighbors.

"They involve the assumption that a Government, in the exercise of its paternal authority over its subjects, can judge better than themselves what will best subserve their welfare in the use of what they have. The wasteful extravagance apparent in every community seems to call for the interposition of Government to curb the lavish outlays for dress, diet, equipage. Hence, such laws are found on the statute books of almost all nations. Under an aristocratic organization of society, such enactments have been made in part for the purpose of maintaining class distinctions, certain features of dress and style being made symbols of rank.

"This legislation has, however, almost entirely failed of its object, because it is so easily evaded—and because the laws are so directly at variance with men's common sense of right. This actual experience, and a better understanding of the functions of government have led to the abandonment in modern times of all sumptuary laws, properly so called.

"Some laws for the regulation of public morals are demanded for the general good—the public liberty in this light may require some limitation of personal rights. For this end it is both legitimate and wise to restrict the sale and the use of articles which cause disease, pauperism and misery, and so increase the burdens of a whole community. Yet, even for this object, laws are found to be of little avail, except as they are sustained by a prevalent public sentiment and usage."

Now, there is no doubt that the last passage but one I have read here could be applied to the hon. gentleman's temperance proposals, but here I contend is one of his radical errors. He and his friends deliberately charge upon wines, beers and spirits, crimes which purely belong to their imitations. What did the hon. member from Ottawa here admit in the debate on the second reading? He admitted openly that so long as the French and Swiss consumed their own pure native wines they were a sober people, but when their natural drinks failed them, and they consumed adulterated imitations, then they became intemperate. Yet the hon. gentlemen opposite have not the slightest hesitation in charging upon our pure wines and spirits the evils which belong to their imitations. Now, that is unfair and unreasonable, and when it entails such injurious legislation, such espionage, such inquisition into the inner life of men, it is most pernicious. You cannot persuade a man who reads his Bible and is acquainted with its contents, that to drink wine or beer or spirits is necessarily a wrong act, because he has seen wine treated in the Scriptures as one of the greatest blessings which a patriarch could bestow on his son. Every one recollects the touching blessing by the patriarch on his two sons. He told them that with corn and wine had he sustained them; and those who are conversant with other parts of Holy Writ, particularly the Psalms of David, can recollect how the Sweet Singer of Israel said, God had provided for every animal its proper food, but for man he had provided food out of the earth—wine and oil to make his heart glad, and to make him of a cheerful countenance; and yet some hon. gentlemen represent this thing which is given for our good in Scripture, as a baneful and abominable article. I could not allow these remarks of the hon. gentleman opposite to pass without comment. I am willing to support his measure, but I do hope there will be some discretion used in this matter. I admit freely, that after having made a promise that I would support the Bill, and having made it from a sense of necessity that some law restraining intemperance and the sale of liquors should be in operation, not only in the province from which I come, but in other

parts of Canada, I shall vote with my hon. friend, but I confess that my powers of endurance have been sadly tried in this debate. It is impossible to resist the validity of the arguments brought by those who oppose this Bill. Nothing could give me greater pleasure than to see the hon. gentleman who promoted the Temperance Act of 1878 drop these practices and join hands with the true friends of temperance, men who will not interfere with the liberty of the subject, and are willing to advance the temperance cause without incurring a vast number of other and greater evils than drunkeness itself; for I do conceive that to lead men who are, if not amongst the best subjects, at all events honest men, to avoid breaches of the law—to cast stumbling blocks in their way—is a most objectionable policy. I do not question for a moment the sincerity of the hon. gentleman, and I should like to see him join hands with other temperate men such as I myself claim to be; I would be prepared to give him every assistance in my power. I do not wish to occupy the time of the House on this question, but I really could not allow the amendment of the hon. gentleman to pass without saying this much.

HON. MR. VIDAL—My hon. friend has just reminded me that I left out a part of the argument which I intended to address to the House when speaking on the amendment; that is with reference to this introduction of light wines, beer, etc. I want to tell him that so far from being guided by the principles which he seems to attribute to us, we are guided by a strong sense of public duty and by the light of experience and of the instruction which we get from history and from recorded facts.

HON. MR. DEVER—So are we.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I speak in the name of 100,000 people in this country who have petitioned Parliament. I know their sentiments, and I challenge anyone to deny that statement.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I deny it.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Now, as a matter of fact in the year 1830, when the Duke of Wellington was Prime Minister of England, the drunkeness and consequent pauperism that prevailed in that country attracted attention. It was felt to be a necessity in Parliament that something should be done to arrest the downward progress of the nation into drunkenness and crime and poverty, which was so marked that no one could escape noticing it. What was done? The very theory advanced here was advanced then—oh, let us give the people beer and ale and that will stop their drinking gin and strong liquors. With this design the celebrated beer Act was passed under which the beer houses sprung up all over the kingdom.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE — What about education in those days?

HON. MR. VIDAL—Education does not affect this particular question at all. I am speaking of facts. I say when that beer system was introduced, so far from lessening drunkeness and lowering the poor rates or in any way benefitting the country by the introduction of those malt liquors, it was found by examination of the statistics furnished by the Government that the same amount of distilled liquors was used the following year as had been consumed the previous year, plus all the beer. The effect was drunkenness was greatly increased; there were hundreds of people who would not have been seen going into a gin shop, but who felt no objection to going into a beer shop where they went merely to get a glass of ale. The consequence was the taste for alcohol —for it is for the alcohol that is in it people drink beer — increased. Take the alcohol out of the beer and what is it?

HON. MR. SMITH—There is not 5½ per cent in beer.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Take that 5½ per cent. out of it, and people would not drink the residue.

HON. MR. FLINT—The balance is dirty water.

HON. MR. VIDAL—So all these attempts to substitute ale and beer for spirits were found to be a failure; the use of strong liquors was increased by them. Now, in 1860 there was a repetition by

Mr. Gladstone, of the same experiment, by encouraging the use of wine, because he had then the same argument that is addressed to us now, that those delightfnl light wines of France, if we let them into the country, would take away the taste for these stronger liquors, and people will drink them. The same result followed. I appeal to the statistics. There is no denying the facts, because there was increased intemperance, crime and pauperism. There was again the same amount of spirits, plus all the light wines. Now, these are historical facts which cannot be gainsaid or denied, and upon these grounds we take our stand. It is of no use, with a view to getting rid of intemperance, to supply light wines and ale ; it will not cure the evil.

The committee divided on the amendment, which was adopted—contents, 42 ; non-contents, 20.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Does my hon. friend from Halifax propose to move the other two amendments?

HON. MR. ALMON—I think I am satisfied with having carried this one to-night.

HON. MR. POWER—I give notice that I will move mine at the third reading.

HON. MR. VIDAL moved that the following be inserted as clause A :—

"Section one hundred and eight of the first above recited Act is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'provisions' in the fifth line thereof the following words : 'Of the Temperance Act of 1864 or,' and section one hundred and nine of the said first above recited Act is also hereby amended by inserting after the word 'provisions' in the second line thereof the following words : 'Of the Temperance Act 1864, or,' "

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. MCMASTER, from the committee, reported the Bill with amendments.

The Senate adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HON. MR. VIDAL.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, May 7th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (U), "An Act regarding Canned Goods," (Sir Alex Campbell.)

Bill (87), "An Act to amend the Act intituled 'An Act to provide for the Employment without the walls of Common Jails of Prisoners sentenced to imprisonment therein,' " (Sir Alex. Campbell).

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The order of the day having been called,

Committee of the Whole House on (Bill 31) To amend and consolidate Civil Service Acts, 1882, 1883 and 1884.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said : I have been asked to postpone this order of the day and put it to the foot of the list, in order to enable my hon. friend from Sarnia to proceed with the Temperance Bill. I had no objections to doing so, but I understand now from him that he is not ready to go on.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The hon. gentleman from Ottawa, who takes a very deep interest in this Bill, and is anxious to be here at its final stage, and vote upon it, is not able to be present to-day.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—He ought to be here.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Very serious and important alterations have been made in the Bill since it came into this House. I should like to have the order postponed, because I want to confer with the members in the other House who promote the Bill, to see how far they can assent to the amendments which have been made here, or how far they should be resisted. I ask

what has never been denied to any member of this House, to be allowed time to consider the effect of important amendments made to a Bill which he has in charge.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—Whatever may be done ultimately with the Temperance Bill, it seems to me that I have no right to put the hon. gentleman in a worse position than he now occupies, and, therefore, I should go on now with the bill which stands first on the orders of the day.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (31), "An Act to amend and consolidate the Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883 and 1884."

In the Committee,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: In Clause No. 3, the following words are added:—

And such other officers and employes in the North-West Territories holding positions, which, if held in other parts of Canada, would bring them under the provisions of the Civil Service Acts, as the Governor-in-Council brings under the provisions of such Acts.

I explained, at the second reading of the Bill, that the object of this is to bring under the provisions of the Act those members of the civil service who are serving in the North-West Territories as far as possible.

HON. MR. POWER—Do you not think that the word "other" is objectionable there?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, I think it would be better to strike it out.

The clause was amended by striking out the word "other," and adopted as amended.

HON. MR. POWER—Would the Minister of Justice explain the 7th clause. It is as follows:—

7. Any person who is a member of the civil service at the time of the passing of this Act shall be classified in the respective class in which he has been appointed.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It became desirable to pass it in this way; that persons who are in the civil service were transferred from one Department to another, and in the new Department they got above the rank which they had held, and in that way derived an advantage over other officers, which was not quite fair. It is proposed to make it imperative that the officer should be classified in the class in which he was appointed.

The clause was adopted.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Now, we come to the Board of Examiners. The hon. member from Halifax objected to certain features in that clause because the expense is increased. I asked for an explanation in regard to that, and I think the committee will believe that the explanations which I shall give are satisfactory. In the first place, the expense is as stated by the hon. gentleman—that is, it was $1,600 and it is proposed to increase it; but that was not the whole of the case as it stood. It turns out, on inquiry, that the examiners have been unable to get through the examination within the 60 days mentioned by law. Therefore, additional supplementary sums were asked for to augment that sum, so as to give them $5 a day for the time in which they were employed, and a sum of $900 was provided to indemnify them for the work in excess of the 60 days. I understand from the Secretary of State, who has charge of the matter, that they demonstrated that it was not possible for them to get through in 60 days, and therefore, this additional sum was provided. I have ascertained how the remuneration now proposed was fixed. I find from that officer that it is paid out of the fees which those who come out for examination pay, and these fees enable the additional sum to be paid. In 1884, the fees from candidates for preliminary examinations amounted to $2,052, and for promotion examinations, $500, making altogether $2,552. There was paid to sub-examiners $550 leaving $2,002. Therefore, the Secretary of State thought he might very fairly give the examiners the $600 which this Bill proposes to give them and which they are getting now, though they are now only receiving it partly under the Act and partly by a spe-

cial vote. If these gentlemen work, as they do, for more than sixty days, and that work is necessary, they ought to be paid for the whole period of their labor, and as the fees from the candidates sufficiently meet the amount, there is no reason why they should not be paid. I have asked, also, about the other point which was taken with reference to the number of candidates who go up, and what becomes of them. I find that the candidates who passed preliminary examinations are 800, and the qualifying examinations 400; but a good many of the 400 must have passed the previous preliminary examination, so that must have reduced the 1,200 to, perhaps, 800 or 900. The qualifying examination is the second one, and a candidate cannot usually go to the qualifying examination until he has passed the preliminary, so when we say that 400 passed the one and 800 the other, we are speaking of the same persons, so far as a great proportion who passed the qualifying examinations are concerned. Altogether, 1,600 passed either one or both examinations. There have been appointed, of those who passed the preliminary examination, 200, and of those who passed the qualifying examination 300, and temporarily employed 50; so that there are about 550 out of the whole number that passed, who have been employed. I understand from a gentleman who is more immediately concerned with the examiners, that many candidates went up for examination only to obtain a certificate of having passed—as he has learnt verbally—and when in April, 1884, circulars were sent to those who passed the first examinations, asking particulars of their nationality, religion, &c., about 25 per cent. of the number could not be found at the addresses given

I asked for specimens of the replies of those who had answered. The officer could give me only one, although he had received several. This is a reply to the circular which he sent out:—

DEAR SIR—Yours of the 29th ult. to hand concerning myself and the questions to be answered. I enclose the same with answers. You will see from above heading that any intention of ever going into the civil service on my part is banished; however, I presume you only want information required for sake of returns.

This is addressed to Mr. McGee, Clerk of the Privy Council, and I learn from him that he had received many such replies, though he could not lay his hand upon them this morning. He believes that those who pass examinations and are not employed do derive great advantages from the civil service certificate, and they get employed more readily elsewhere, and in that respect it is an advantage to them, although they have not succeeded in the immediate object of their ambition? I was mistaken the other day in a statement I made to the House, that the names of the persons who pass these examinations appear in the *Gazette*, graded according to their respective attainment and the number of marks which they get. I find that they are arranged alphabetically, and not according to merit. The reason of that is this: the complete competitive system has not been introduced. Neither this Government nor the late Administration thought that the purely competitive system could be introduced into this country at this stage in its history, and personally I venture to doubt whether a man who passes the competitive examination, and gets the highest number of marks, is of necessity the best man for an appointment. The House will see that it was a grave question for any Government, in a comparatively young country, to adopt a competitive examination system, pure and simple. It is only recently that they adopted it in England, and ours is an approach to that system. We have, at all events, secured some advantages. First, that no one can be appointed who has not passed an examination, and second, that no one can pass who is not of a certain age. These two changes exclude many things which might be used to the disadvantage of the service. They prevent the appointment of a person who has not proper attainments, or whose age would render his appointment undesirable by entailing unnecessary expense upon the country, inasmuch as he would the sooner come to be superannuated. I think that these grounds are sufficient, at present, for the limiting of the system in the sense which I have mentioned and to the degree which I have described. Now, to go back to clause No. 8, I should add also the explanatiçn that a secretary is to be appointed. The salary of the secretary is now paid to one of the members of the board of examiners. He does not get his

salary as a member of the civil service board in addition to that of secretary, but he gets $1,000. The expense of the Board is increased by the present Bill, but the whole expense is covered by the fees. The experience the Department has had shows that it is desirable to have a secretary devoted to that duty. For instance, the duty of the secretary has been discharged by Mr. LeSueur, who is a member of the board. The fact that he has had to act as secretary has prevented him from taking part in the examinations as fully as it was desirable to do. The examination papers got very much behind in consequence of his not being able to give his whole time to his duties as examiner, and in consequence of not having the full clerical assistance. People are anxious to know whether they have passed or not, and it happens now that months after the examination the examiners are still behindhand with the papers, because it takes a long time to go over them. Long papers are sent in and each paper requires a close examination. It takes a long time for the board of examiners to report—months in fact—so I think that perhaps the change is an improvement and as the expenses are met by the fees, I hope the House will concur in believing that it is an improvement on the present system, that it is expediting the work of the commission, and doing so within the amount which those who come up to be examined pay for their certificates. They pay for certificates, not only with the idea that they have a chance of entering the civil service, but also with the possibility of those certificates being useful to them if they do not enter the civil service,—engaging in other pursuits and occupations. Then, there is a clause which provides that the board shall be supervised by the Secretary of State, but that is done substantially now. Of course the board of examiners must be placed under the control of some one Department which will convey communications from the Privy Council to the board of examiners, settle subjects of examinations which are from time to time altered, &c. It was mentioned last session of Parliament, that there was a general outcry that the examinations were too severe, particularly in some branches—arithmetic, I think, was one. Questions were submitted to candidates, which, speaking for myself, I know I could not answer, and it was thought that was an unnecessary severity shown to young men coming up for examination, and there was a general feeling that the examination should be made less difficult. That matter could only be disposed of by the Privy Council. It comes up on the recommendation of some minister, and the minister who has really done it in the past, is the Secretary of State ; this is merely expressing in language what has been the usage up to this time. The board has been attached to that office, and orders have been given through the Secretary of State. The papers, after having been examined by the board, are sent up to his office, and remain on file there for a year, when they are destroyed. The Secretary of State is the man through whom the intercourse between the commissoners and the Government is conducted. The hon. member from Halifax was mistaken in supposing that there was any control over the service at large. The Secretary of State has no such control ; it is only over the board of examiners.

Hon. Mr. POWER—With respect to the second sub-section, while I do not feel altogether convinced as to the necessity for, or desirability of, the enactment, I may say the explanation made by the Minister has removed a great part of the objection I felt to that clause ; but the Minister has not at all removed my objection to the change made in the payment of the members of the board. In the first place, the Minister's calculations were based on the supposition that as many men would continue to go up in the future as have gone up in the past two or three years. I think that is in the highest degree improbable, because, according to the statistics which the Minister gave us, there are already some hundreds of young men who have passed the examinations and for whom places have not been found. For one year alone it appears that nearly one half of those who passed the examination were still unplaced, and of course the number of persons who have passed the examinations and have not found situations will increase with each succeeding year if they continue to go up in such numbers. It is reasonable therefore to suppose that the

number of persons who go up will diminish, and consequently I do not think the Minister can calculate upon that. I think he said that $2,500 each year were received from fees paid by the candidates; but I think that the Minister has been misled, if he supposes that even at present the fees paid by the candidates meet the expenditures of the board. As the board stands as constituted by the existing law two members receive $300 a year; that is $600, and the secretary receives $1,000. That makes the total expenditure authorized by statutes $1,600 a year. Now, let us see what the total expenditure will be under this Bill. There are three commissioners at $600 a year each; that is $1,800; the secretary $1,000; that is $2,800, and there is a provision for a third-class clerk. The salaries of third-class clerks range, I think, from $400 to $1,000. I take the salary which stands half-way, $700. Add that to the $2,800, and you have $3,500.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—What is the third-class clerk for?

HON. MR. POWER—He is to act as a clerk to assist the board. Instead of costing $1,800, the board will cost $3,500 a year—that is $1,000 beyond the amount which even now is received as fees from candidates. I think, therefore, that that in itself constitutes a serious objection to this change. Then this sum of $3,500, I think, is too much, looking at the work done. The Minister stated in reply to something I said the other day, that there were only two examinations held in the year. Hon. gentlemen will see that there are examinations to be held twice a year. The examiners have to prepare papers for the preliminary examination, which is a very simple one, and the papers for which require very little trouble in preparation. They will have to prepare papers for the qualifying examinations, which are more difficult. The papers for the promotion examinations are chiefly prepared in the different Departments. I know there are hon. gentlemen here—I think the chairman of the committee (Mr. Allan) is one—who is familiar with the conducting of examinations in universities. I happen to have had a little experience that way myself. The chairman, or any hon. gentleman who has had experience that way will see that $3,500 a year for conducting examinations at two periods of the year is altogether too much. Those examiners prepare those papers; they have sub-examiners—persons whose services are provided for in the next clause—who police examinations in the different centres—that is, the examinations held in Toronto, Halifax, St. John and other places. The papers are sent to the sub-examiners; and it is a very simple matter, and the expense to be incurred should not be great. As to the length of time taken in examining those papers, anyone who is familiar with examinations as conducte in universities, or who understa nd the way in which examinations for teachers' licenses in the different provinces are conducted, must know that a man who is skilled in his business can dispose of a large number of papers in a short time. I think the permanent expenditure that is proposed to be fastened on the country by this Bill is altogether unjustifiable. If I thought there was any probability of the amendment passing, I should move an amendment to the effect that the examining board should be constituted and paid as heretofore, but I do not think that, under the circumstances, there is any object in doing that. The Minister made a statement with respect to the impracticability of adopting the competitive system in Canada. I do not think that he gave us any reason for that statement. When we find that in the small colonies in the West Indies they have adopted the competitive system as they have it in England, and when we find that in the United States, where the system of political appointments had a much greater hold on the people than here, and that in several states of the union also, this system has been adopted, it must be clear that the minister has no foundation for the statement that the adoption of that system would be impracticable here. The truth is, that the ministry—I do not say the Hon. Minister of Justice, because I think in that way he differs from a good many other members of the Government—do not wish to give up the power of appointing solely their own political friends, and consequently while they adopt a portion of the skeleton of the civil service system, the backbone of the system they leave out—that is, the competitive examinations.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I do not believe that the competitive examination is sufficient of itself for an appointment to office. A man may stand at the head of the list, and yet be utterly unqualified for the service. That is very well known. I doubt whether the increased cost which this Bill must entail, will be commensurate with the work to be done. I am with the hon. member from Halifax in believing that the work must decrease instead of increase, and that the number of persons now qualified will be sufficient to deter many from going up for the purpose of being examined. As to making the Secretary of State the medium between the Government and the Examining Board, I think it is a very proper provision, because there should be some control over the Board by the Government. I know myself, from what I have heard from persons who have gone before the Board, that the examination in arithmetic has been very severe; so much so, that although at one time I thought I was a good arithmetician, yet I am sure I could not have answered half the questions that were proposed to the candidates. Therefore, upon the whole, although I approve of the Bill, yet I do not think we can expect that the fees will increase, but rather that they will diminish, for the number of those who go up for examination must be smaller in the future than in the past. I doubt very much whether the advantage to be gained will correspond with the increased expenditure that will be required.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I ventured at the second reading to make a few remarks as to the publication of the lists and the standing of candidates, and the explanations of the hon. Minister do not at all tend to elucidate the objections that I took then. It appears that the lists which were spoken of in the debate on the second reading are not published in the order of merit, but are published alphabetically, and it appears also from the explanation of the Minister that appointments are not made on the competitive principle at all. The Government do not acquire the services of the best candidates, and they leave it optional with themselves to take, or appoint, or leave out whom they may. Unless the competitive system is to be adopted, we are going to undertake a very considerable and useless expense, because those expensive examinations can only be justified on the plea of the necessity of getting the very best men that can be obtained for the service; yet the Government will not take the only means to secure the best men; they will take whom they please out of the list, and that is the very point that it ought to be the duty of this body to prevent. I cannot see that there is any analogy between the competitive examinations in England and competitive examinations in Canada. If the system is a good one, it is equally applicable on both sides of the Atlantic, and I cannot charge my mind with having listened to any arguments coming from the other side that at all bear against the propriety of adopting competitive examinations in Canada. Another remark which fell from the hon. member, was as to the great time that would be occupied in examining those papers. I think if hon. gentlemen were to enquire as to the results of the examinations in any of the numerous colleges in Canada they would find that there is no great difficulty in examining papers. They are all identical in form, and a skilled examiner will master the details of them in a very few minutes. There must be some very bad management, either from want of perseverance in the work, or from some other cause, if the objection taken is really valid, that too much time elapses before the papers are finally examined. I principally rose for the purpose of suggesting to the hon. gentleman opposite to introduce some clause into the Bill that will enable the candidates to receive their papers within a given time after the examination—that the property in the examination papers should remain in the candidate, and that the candidate should have the papers on application.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have no objection to that.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—I would, if the Minister of Justice will allow me, suggest that the examiners should be chosen from amongst the members of the civil service who are superannuated. It might be a means by which to avoid paying so much for examiners, and it would also meet another difficulty. If it is the fact that the examination takes a great deal of the

time of the examiners, it might interfere to a considerable extent with the efficiency of the service. I understand that all the members of the civil service are supposed to have plenty to do in the performance of their ordinary duties. There is also a class of public officers who retire from the service because they are not able to do very severe work, but who would be in a position to make those examinations, and a slight salary would be beneficial to them, and they might be in a position to give more time to those examinations. We may suppose that those officers who are superannuated, after the experience of many years in the public service, would be better qualified to conduct those examinations than many officers who may be appointed under the operation of this Act, and who may be quite new to the civil service.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The difficulty in that suggestion would be that you might not always get members of the civil service that have been superannuated, who are fit for the position of examiners. They are men usually advanced in life, and although in their youth they may have had sufficient knowledge to conduct such examinations, they might not be so well qualified in later years. Undoubtedly it may be a good thing to employ superannuated officers as examiners, when they are qualified for the position, and I can assure my hon. friend that it is done. We have, for instance, Mr. LeSueur on the Board of Examiners at this moment, and I have no doubt that the Government, when they come to appoint other examiners, may avail themselves of the services of superannuated officers; but I do not think it would be desirable to tie the Government down to appointments in that class. I think it should be open to them to employ whom they think best. With reference to the suggestion of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, I will prepare an amendment before the Bill goes through finally, to provide that the papers belonging to the candidate shall be returned to him within a given time, say two or three months, on his making an application for them.

HON. MR. POWER—I beg to move that the 4th sub-section be struck out and that the following be substituted: "Each member of the Board shall be paid $5 per diem when actually engaged in that work, not however to exceed sixty days in one year." That is the provision in the existing law. I think that probably hereafter in a great many cases it will be quite sufficient to have only one examination in a year, and to pay $600 for a man to conduct one examination is altogether unreasonable.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think there is any occasion to substitute anything, for if this clause is stricken out the matter would naturally fall back to the old Act. I do not think my hon. friend is right in proposing that the committee have power to change the salaries. The salaries must either be taken as they are or be left out altogether. I do not think there is any power on the part of this House to change them, and certainly the proposed substitution is not necessary, because if this clause is stricken out we naturally fall back on the provision in the clause of the old Bill. In fact, the whole matter presents itself to the committee in this light; are these improvements or not? If not, we reject them and fall back on the old Bill. After the explanations given, I think the House will be satisfied that the increase will be reasonably provided for by the fees, and also that it is not such an increase as the hon. gentleman supposes.

HON. MR. POWER—There is an increase of $900.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We all know that if we want to get good examiners we must pay them; you cannot expect men to work on a tedious task of examining papers, and going through this round of duties year after year without you pay them reasonably, and $5 a day for the time they are employed does not seem to be unreasonable, and I cannot yield to the hon. gentleman.

HON. MR ALEXANDER—I am very much inclined to agree with my hon. friend from Halifax. It is very well known with regard to those examinations, that they are upon subjects of the most elementary character. A clerk in the civil service is required to understand well the elementary

branches of education, but is not examined on subjects of science. It appears to me that some steps should be taken by the Government to meet the objection raised on the floor of this House, respecting appointments. We know that twice as many men come up for examination for the civil service as can ever hope to get appointment. There is some deception with regard to this matter, that young men are led to come before the board to be examined, without having the most distant hope of getting any appointment. Why should not the examination take place after the applicant gets the appointment? Why should he be required to be examined before getting the assurance that he will be appointed? We find numbers of young men leaving their homes and incurring railway and hotel expenses, in order to be examined, and, after perhaps passing the board, they find that they have no hope of obtaining an appointment without the direct influence of a ministerial supporter. There are cases of this kind in my own county.

HON. MR. POWER—I think the effect of striking out the 4th sub-clause would not be what the minister thinks it would, because if he looks at that clause of the Bill he will see that it repeals all previous Civil Service Acts. Then, as to our right to make a change, I do not care to speak positively, but I think we have no right to do anything which shall increase the charge—

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Or diminish, or alter.

HON. MR. POWER—I think we can reduce—I do not speak positively.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think, under the circumstances, it is safer for me to take the objection that this amendment is not in order. I do not think we have a right to make this change, and I hope my hon. friend will withdraw his amendment.

HON. MR. POWER—If it is held to be out of order, of course I have to withdraw it.

THE CHAIRMAN—I think the hon. gentleman from Halifax is out of order; that he will either have to move to strike out the clause altogether or withdraw his amendment.

The amendment was withdrawn, and the clause was agreed to.

On the 34th clause,

HON. MR. DICKEY—I understood on a former occasion that the Minister of Justice stated that he was under the impression that the list of the persons who are found qualified, and published in the *Canada Gazette*, showed the grading of those who had passed?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I did say so, and I explained the mistake just now.

HON. MR. DICKEY—It has been urged that the selection from these persons who are qualified should be according to order of merit. That has not been conceded by the Government, and the point has not been pressed; but it is very important that the two Houses of Parliament should know exactly the proper grading of those candidates, their names and so on, and therefore I would propose in order to provide that, that the clause, at the end of it, should read this way, "showing the grading of the candidates in such examination, and a similar list shall be laid annually on the table of both Houses of Parliament within 15 days after the opening of each session." That would give members an opportunity of seeing how the promotions or appointments agree with the grading and the examination, and we would give them that sort of information that they now have not.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I hardly think that that would be desirable, for one or two reasons. In the first place, we are not adopting the competitive system, and then to publish the names of the candidates and their grading would only increase the disappointment to them of not being employed, and in that way would seem to make their failure more painful than perhaps it would otherwise be. The grading could always be obtained by Parliament—for instance, if

they wished to bring an accusation against the Government for some departure from the rule, they could move for a return of the papers. We have the grading in the Privy Council, and it could be brought down, but I do not think it should be published in the *Canada Gazette*, or laid on the table of Parliament, unless Parliament desires it, for the reasons I have given. As long as we do not adopt the competitive system, pure and simple, that should be sufficient. Say there were 30 candidates, one of them would be at the top of the list, and no doubt it would be gratifying to him, but the 29 men who would not be at the top of the list might not desire that their grading should be published.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I am afraid that the reasons given by the Minister of Justice for not publishing the grading, would rather lead people to suspect that it is absolutely necessary it should be published, for although the principle of appointing the first on the list has not been urged, yet I think it is desirable, if there is any reason at all for grading them, that Parliament should know, and that members who desire to see how candidates are graded, should be in possession of the information. It is a very simple matter that the list should be laid on the table of Parliament each year. We find, in another part of this Bill, although perhaps the matter is a little more serious, the legislation proceeds in exactly the same direction. The 11th clause provides, that when a deputy head is removed from his office, a statement of the reasons for so doing shall be laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament within the first 15 days of the next following session. That shows that the desire on the part of the friends of this Act is to give information to Parliament of what is done in that case, and with respect to candidates who have passed the examination, I think it is quite necessary that Parliament should also have full information as to their grading.

HON. MR. POWER—I am quite surprised at the regard the Minister of Justice shows for the feelings of the candidates who go up for examination. I think it is an almost universal rule, where candidates go up for public examinations, that their names are published in the order of merit. I think the rule works altogether differently from what the Minister says it does, and that it would be a great source of satisfaction to the candidate who passed a good examination to know from the publication in the *Gazette* that he stood first, second or third on the list, even though he did not get appointed, rather than to be left completely in the dark as to where he stood on the list. Looking at the advantage which the minister or some of his friends claim as arising from candidates passing those examinations, that parties were made more eligible for appointments in banks and other offices of private persons or companies, I think it is exceedingly desirable even in that view that the names should be published in the order of merit, because if a bank, for instance, wanted a clerk, and wished to select a man who passed this examination, they would naturally be disposed to take a candidate who had passed high up on the list, and it is information that the public who, after all, are paying to a great extent for the carrying out of this system, are entitled to, and I move that these words be added at the end of the clause: "and the names shall be arranged in the order of merit."

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It might so happen that the candidate who stood at the head of the list might have been, in the previous examination, at the foot of the list, so that it would really not show the position in which he stood on the whole roll of candidates qualified for clerkship.

HON. MR. DICKEY—The words which I proposed to put in as an amendment are: "showing the grading of the candidates on such examination," but the hon. gentleman from Halifax seems to have been more successful with the Minister with his amendment than I am.

HON. MR. POWER—I did not know that the hon. gentleman from Amherst had moved his amendment.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I think it is objectionable to adopt the amendment of the hon. member from Halifax, for many reasons. In the first place, it is invidious to those who go up for examination and do not succeed. It is not a competitive

examination ; it is merely to ascertain who are qualified for certain positions, and I think the Government of the day might be trusted to make their own selections. There may be reasons, and very sound reasons, why the candidate at the head of the list ought not to be appointed. There ought to be no claim even implied by the publication of such a list that the candidate would receive an appointment, and I think it would be exceedingly undesirable that such an amendment should be accepted.

The amendment was declared to be lost on a division, and the clause was agreed to.

On the 37th clause,

HON. MR. POWER—Whenever this measure has been before us, I have protested against those exceptions—at least some of them—provided in sub-section 2. I think there is some reason perhaps for exempting some of the Customs officers from the operation of the Act with respect to examination, but as to city postmasters, there is no reason why they should not come under the law. There is no officer who requires to be more thoroughly informed as to the manner of prosecuting business in the Department, than a city postmaster, and it is a very serious defect in the system that that officer is not required to be appointed under the Act. It is not necessary to go very far to find instances of the abuse of this power by the Government. In the city of Ottawa, the postmaster, an old and experienced and thoroughly well-qualified officer, died some three years ago. His assistant was a man very well qualified to fill the position as postmaster. The Government, instead of promoting the assistant, or appointing any one who was familiar with the post office business, appointed a gentleman who had been a supporter of theirs in the House of Commons. I do not think any one will say that that gentleman, although he was a very amiable and good man, was at all qualified for the office which he filled. The work was undoubtedly done by the deputy, and the large salary was paid to the gentleman who was put at the head of the office, and who gave no value for the money he received. That postmaster died, and within the last few months we have had another appointment made. I think the last appointment more objectionable than the previous one. The late postmaster was a gentleman who had served his party in the legislature for many years, and had a political claim upon the Government, but the gentleman who has been recently appointed is a man who is not a bit better qualified to fill the office than his predecessor, and who has not even the claim that he had done much political service. His occupation as an hotel-keeper could not have qualified him to be a postmaster, and what claim it gave him upon the Government for the appointment is something I cannot understand. The Minister of Justice was very careful in a former clause of this Bill as to what the feelings of candidates might be on seeing their names published in the *Gazette*, when they did not stand as high up on the list as they might have expected to be ; but I think he should have some regard for the feelings of an officer who has been in the employ of the Department for many years, who has served the country faithfully, and who is entitled on every reasonable ground to be promoted. I say that the minister should have some consideration for his feelings when he sees an incompetent man without any claim whatever to the position appointed over his head. I think it would be hard to find a more glaring case of the abuse of the power which this clause gives to the Government than the one to which I refer. I did speak before as to collectors of inland revenue ; but the officers of the Department, fortunately, have been able to remove the objection with respect to that Department, and those collectors, who are most important officers, are hereafter to be subject to the provisions of this Act.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think my hon. friend should assume that the gentleman has been appointed as postmaster for Ottawa is incompetent, or that he will not, and cannot, adequately discharge the duties of his office. That the deputy was not promoted, I myself regret. I acknowledge the merit of that officer. I know him well, and having been once at the head of the Post Office Department, I know his merits, and should

have been very glad to have seen him made postmaster of this place. The truth is, and it is quite understood, that it is necessary to have some of those offices at the disposal of the Government for the time being—that they should have some few offices to give to political friends, not because they are better qualified than their neighbors to be postmasters or inland revenue collectors, but because it is necessary to carry on the Government.

HON. MR. POWER—That is honest, at any rate.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is a reason which may not recommend itself to the mind of my hon. friend, but it is a good, sound reason nevertheless, and, if the latitude is not too great, I think it is only fair that the Government should have that patronage, whether we are in the Government, or whether my hon. friends opposite are in the Government. They are not tied down in England as we are here ; they have a variety of patronage at their disposal all over the world, with which they can reward their political friends.

HON. MR POWER—High Commissionerships, for instance.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Here we have few appointments of the kind, and I am glad that this was originally done by the Conservative Government ; they came boldly to the point, and said that some few—half a dozen offices—should be left at the disposal of the Government, with which they could reward gentlemen who have been serviceable to the party to which they belong. My hon. friend who has raised the objection does not know the services which the gentleman who has been appointed postmaster at Ottawa, may have rendered to the political party to which I belong, he not being in our secrets. I dare say that some future Government, in whose secrets he may be, may know what the merits of some future Mr. Gouin may be, and I dare say he may be then defending such an appointment to a postmastership.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—It seems to me that the Minister of Justice has made some large admissions in these few remarks. I could not help reverting in memory, while he was speaking, to the period of the two Georges, 100 years ago, when it was thought essential to the conduct of the Government service that the ministry of the day should have control of certain Government berths, but I cannot see that the point would come in here at all. It does seem to me that if you contemplate improvements in the post office management, you must introduce into that Department the very highest ability that it is possible to obtain, and that sort of tact and ingenuity that is so desirable is not common in—I was going to say—worn out politicians, but perhaps it is going too far ; but it is less likely that the proper qualifications are to be found in a man of that sort than in a young man who has his spurs to win in the Department. It is not the time to speak of the position of our Post Office Department ; we are certainly making great improvements in Canada, but there are a great many more to be made. Comparing it with the Post Office Department of the United States, we find that they are taking the lead of us in many important points—for instance, in the reduction of postage, and other facilities given for the convenience of the public. These are matters that the stereotyped politician does not trouble himself about, but if young blood is introduced into the Department, it will feel at once that it does not consist with the reputation of the public service that the Post Office Department of Canada should be behind the postal service of any other part of the world. The Hon. Minister of Justice says that in Canada there is no such patronage at the disposal of the Government as there is in England, and he points to her possessions all over the world where she can dispose of her young people who aspire to positions in the public service ; but if you take the proportion in population, it is very true we have not got the Indies or the Australian or African colonies as England has, and a great many dependencies, but we have our great North-West, a country where the organization of the postal service is of the utmost importance, and all these things just point to the one fact, that we must get into that Department the very best and most intelligent young men to be found in the service,

and not fill up the different offices with politicians, who may have been very good men, and very serviceable to their party in the House of Commons, but are utterly unfit for such a position as postmaster.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—The leader of the House says that it is very proper that the Government must have the disposal of half a dozen offices in the service; it is very well known to every one in the country that every office in the Civil Service is held as value to be given as rewards for political services. It is perfectly well known to be the case.

HON. MR. POWER—I am glad to have got the admission from the Minister of Justice that in this case there had been an abuse of the power of appointment.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No I did not admit anything of the kind.

HON. MR. POWER—I understood the hon. Minister to say that if he had been at the head of the Department he would have made a different appointment.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend is mistaken; I did not admit anything of the kind.

HON. MR. POWER—I was going to say further that the Government cannot complain of not having a sufficient number of appointments to bestow on a reasonable number of followers, because if this Government have not as many gifts absolutely at their disposal as the Imperial Government have, I think that proportionately they have a great many more. Take, for instance, the number of commissions that have been issued since this Government came into power. It is perfectly astounding, almost everything that it is desirable to acquire information on, work which ought to be done by the Government themselves, is made an excuse for appointing a commission, and these commissioners are handsomely paid, and the Government have succeeded in rewarding many of their followers very handsomely for labors of very small value. As the member from Woodstock has suggested, although a man may not get appointed to the ordinary branches of the civil service without an examination, still the examination is easy in itself, and when appointments are all made from the one political party, I think there is the less excuse, therefore, for appointing men who are not qualified to those offices.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It does not always follow that the best man for the appointment is always to be found in the Department. It does not at all follow that you may not get new and useful blood outside. Of course, it depends a good deal on the selection, and I admit that the probabilities in the post office Department are that you will get the best men inside of the Department; but it does not always follow. I know instances where men have been appointed from outside who are as keen in their duties, and as ambitious to make the Department a success and to adopt every new means, and are as jealous in every way, of the progress and efficiency of the service as anybody who might have been appointed to the same position after years of experience in the Department.

HON. MR. ALMON—The senior member for Halifax will remember a case in point, in Halifax itself. During the time of the Mackenzie Government, there was a vacancy in the post office at Halifax, and who did the Mackenzie Government appoint as postmaster there? Did they take, as the hon. member tells us this Government ought to do—did they take the senior officer in that post office and promote him to the position of postmaster? If I remember right, they took the editor of one of the most rabid papers in Halifax, a man without any experience in the postal service, and made him postmaster,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—And a very excellent postmaster he has made.

HON. MR. ALMON—He knew no more of the post office business than to go there and get the letters.

HON. MR. POWER—That appointment was made years before the Civil Service Act was passsed, and consequently it was not a violation of the Act; and in the next place, if my memory serves me,

the senior officer there was not altogether qualified for the position.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—He was perfectly qualified.

HON. MR. POWER—In the next place, and my hon. colleague cannot deny it, the hon. gentleman who was appointed was one of the ablest, most clear-headed, and best business men in Halifax, and he has made an admirable officer.

HON MR. ALMON—How was that known at the time he was appointed?

HON. MR. POWER—I had the good fortune to serve on the school board with that gentleman, and in the city council with him, and in both capacities he was remarkable for his business tact, clear-headedness and soundness of judgment.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I desire to say that he has made a very good postmaster, an excellent officer.

HON. MR. ALMON—I do not say anything against that; it is simply the mode of the appointment I was pointing out.

The clause was agreed to.

On the 43rd clause,

HON. MR. POWER—The 43rd clause provides that promotions made by the head of the Department shall be subject to a probation of not less than six months; but at any time during the first year the head of the Department may reject the person promoted, and so on. It might be desirable that the head of the Department should not be allowed to do that without assigning some cause for the rejection, because it gives him a very arbitrary power. I have no doubt that my hon. friend from Lunenburg thinks it is a very proper thing now; but supposing that most improbable event, a change of Government, should take place, then it would put it in the hands of an iniquitous Minister to reject a man who probably did not deserve to be rejected.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think not. I think that you must trust to the head of the Department; he must be at liberty to reject the party promoted, should the appointment not be a proper one.

HON. MR. POWER—He should give some reasons for it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—He is obliged to justify himself to his own government, but why should he give reasons to the party rejected? He may prove to be dissipated, or lazy, or incompetent; or half a dozen reasons may occur that it may not be wise to inform him of why the promotion should not take place. In any business office the employer does not always give an employé reasons for dispensing with his services if he does not require them any longer. If it is done here with the head of a Department, who has a much larger responsibility, you might have the young man questioning the reasons assigned and getting the head of the Department into the newspapers—I think you must trust the Government with that.

The clause was agreed to.

On the 47th clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is an amendment in this clause to which I would direct the attention of the committee, because we think that it is an improvement in this Bill:—

"Such person (that is a temporary employé) shall not be continued in such temporary employment after the period in which a preliminary or qualifying examination is held, unless he presents himself for examination and obtains a certificate of having passed the necessary examination."

Now, whatever abuse there may have been in the past, and my hon friend from Ottawa seemed to think there had been, in the way of continuing persons employed temporarily, this will have a tendency to put a stop to it.

HON. MR. POWER—This clause gives the Government power, even after a great many persons have passed an examination, to select some other person, and it opens the door to the abuse that the hon. gentle-

man from Ottawa has referred to. Persons come out from the old country, and are put into the Departmants for temporary employment, on the understanding that if they pass the next examination they will be appointed permanently, while young men who belong to the country, and who have passed the examination are not employed.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The change is an improvement; the employment can only be for a short time before an examination can be held. You cannot get all these things perfect at once.

The sub-section was agreed to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Sub-section 3 provides that the temporary clerks so employed shall be paid only out of money voted by Parliament for payment of the contingencies of the Department in which such clerks are employed, or out of money voted by Parliament, for the constructing of works upon which they are employed, so that the vote must be not only for the Department, not only for the division, but for the office or service in which the clerk is employed.

HON MR. POWER—The Minister will see that there is a very large door left open for expenditure by the last provision in that sub-clause, "or out of money voted by Parliament for the construction of works upon which they are employed." It is alleged that a great many clerks, whose services are not necessary, will have their salaries paid out of money voted by Parliament for important public works.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL — There is no avoiding that; you are constructing works; you want a certain number of persons to be employed on that work to keep accounts to look after it, etc., and what are you to pay them out of? For instance, we are putting up a building here opposite this one, for a patent office, and there are no doubt clerks employed there, and what are they to be paid out of unless it is out of the appropriation for that building?

The clause was agreed to.

On the 51st clause,

HON. MR. POWER—I see that it is provided in the 2nd sub-section of this clause that when the duties of any superior officer, during his absence for a period of more than three months, are performed by an officer of an inferior class, that the latter is to receive in addition to his ordinary pay, the difference between it and the pay of the officer whose duty he performs, I do not see why he should get the salary of his superior officer. As a rule, the duties of the superior officer are not any more onerous and probably not as onerous as those of the inferior officer, and the dignity of the position is greater, and one would suppose that that would be compensation enough for the officer who has discharged the duties of the superior, without increasing his salary.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not see why the officer who does the duty of his superior officer should not be paid the salary that would be paid to the senior if he were there. I will show the committee how this operates. Take the case of the deputy postmaster in this city, a very excellent officer, who, after the death of the late postmaster, for a year I dare say, discharged the duties, and had all the responsibilities of postmaster, and did the duty admirably. It was a favor to him, and one which the Government was willing to grant to him, and why should he not be paid the salary of the postmaster while he had his duties and responsibilities?

HON. MR. POWER—Yes, that is a clear case.

The clause was agreed to.

On clause 52,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This clause is to meet the case of an officer who has left the service of the Government, believing that he is in bad health, but it turns out afterwards that whatever had been wrong with him his health has been improved, and he is again fit for his duty, and this clause permits the reappointment of an officer in such a case. I think that it will be found a very useful provision.

We had, not long ago, an officer who supposed, for the time at all events, that he was unable to discharge his duties, and he tendered his resignation. When he recovered, he applied to be re-appointed, and it seemed at the time a very desirable thing that he should be re-employed, and his request was granted.

HON. MR. POWER—There are cases of officers who have been asked by the Government to send in their resignation for misconduct, and who have done so, and under this clause an official of that kind could be, after the storm had blown over, re-appointed by the Government, so that there are two ways of looking at it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That, of course, might be a very wrong thing to do, or perhaps it might be a right thing to do; one cannot say without knowing the circumstances. If a man had been asked to send in his resignation, he certainly ought not to be re-employed if he had done anything which required that step. But, perhaps his resignation might have been asked for under misapprehension, and after the misunderstanding had been explained, it might be only proper that the officer should be re-habilitated. It all depends on the spirit in which it is carried out, and there are certainly cases in which it is desirable that men should be re-employed. I have two or three cases of the kind in my mind at present.

The clause was agreed to.

On the 58th section,

HON. MR. DICKEY said: On that clause I feel bound to say that my criticism is made to appear very absurd, because this clause provides that the proceedings of the examiners under the Act, and the names on the list shall be laid before Parliament. It does not show the order of merit, but it shows all the information which is supposed to be very objectionable, and all of which is to be laid before Parliament.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—It does not show the grading, but it shows the names and the examination papers if necessary.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I do not see the slighest objection to showing the grading as well, because it can possibly do no harm, but it may do a great deal of good to persons who stand high on the list. The public and Parliament should know who were the highest on the list, and who were the lowest. If there is no objection, it would be a great advantage to gentlemen who wish to criticize any appointment, or to raise any question as to preference shown to some applicants over others. We can do a very good thing for them to have that information furnished to members of Parliament. It was only in that view that I suggested it should be so. I am very glad to find in the latter part of the Bill, the very principle which I proposed, and which was not accepted in its proper place.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I would avail myself of the opportunity afforded me by the wording of this clause, which requires a list of those employed, of offering a suggestion to Parliament and to the Government with regard to the appointment of an officer to a position which is now vacant. I refer to the position of Chief Librarian. Now, the members of both Houses have felt, ever since the death of the late lamented Mr. Todd, most deeply his loss.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman's remarks have no refence to the clause before the committee.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—My remarks are relevant to this Bill.

HON. MR. SMITH—There is a bill coming up about it.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I was about to offer this suggestion—

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I have raised a question of order; I ask the Chairman to decide whether the hon. gentleman is in order.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I would simply suggest the propriety of appointing Mr. Bourinot, the present Clerk of the

House of Commons, to the position and paying him a salary of $5,000.—

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I have raised the question of order and I ask for the Chairman's ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN—I think the appointment of the Librarian hardly comes within the compass of this Bill.

On the schedules,

HON. MR. POWER said: I wish to call the attention of the minister to one item in the schedule. It is a matter as to which I have spoken to the minister in private before—at least I think I have—and I think my colleague has spoken to him also, and I regret that I had not thought of it earlier so that something might be done about it. On the second last page, in schedule B, there is this provision—"letter-carriers, messengers, box collectors and porters, $360 to $600, by annual increase of $30." The matter to which I wish to call the attention of the minister is this—I hope he will remember when I refer to it. The salary of these letter-carriers was originally $300, at the time that the Civil Service Act was passed. In 1882 or possibly 1883, their minimum salary was increased to $360. Previous to that, certain letter-carriers had been appointed by the hon. gentleman himself when he was Postmaster General or by some of his colleagues, at the rate of $300 a year. They complain, and I think with reason, that the men who were appointed after them, receive larger salaries than they are getting, because the men who were appointed afterwards began at the rate of $360 while the others had begun at the rate of $300. It is a thing I suppose that is not very easy to avoid, but it is a very hard case indeed. A salary of $300 a year is altogether insufficient to enable a man to support his family. A letter-carrier must be a man of a certain amount of intelligence and respectability. He is a man to whom you feel you can intrust these important documents. The question which I wished to ask the minister was whether some means could not be taken to enable those men who were appointed two or three years previous to the passing of the Act which fixed the minimum at $360 to get an increase beginning with the date of their appointment; so that the men who were appointed in 1882 should not be in a worse position than those appointed in 1883. I think that possibly some arrangement might be made by the Government which could effect that, and I think my hon. colleague agrees with me.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not remember the hon. gentleman speaking to me on the subject, but I recognize the possible hardship of the case. I think the only remedy would be, not to alter this Bill at all, but to give a special vote to these letter-carriers who have suffered. I will mention the matter to the Postmaster General and see if anything can be done.

HON. MR. POWER—I make the suggestion, not at all on behalf of political friends of mine, but on behalf of friends of my colleague.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The only thing new in the schedule is the inspector of letter-carriers. I mentioned at the second reading of the Bill, why the appointment was desirable, and I think the House concurred in it. The only thing remaining over is the question put by the hon. member from Halifax with reference to clause 10, from which certain words were struck out—"or until he has obtained the certificate required by law." I think if the hon. gentleman does not object, I will move that the committee rise and the Bill be reported, and on the third reading I will give that explanation.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I hope the minister will allow me to suggest that as the Bill has to come up again, he will take into consideration the propriety, as it is now quite clear that this information which I thought desirable should be laid before Parliament is to be submitted by this Bill, that a few words shall be put in to show the order in which these men stood on the list. That could be done in the 41st line of clause 58, by inserting after the word "candidates" the following: "in the order of merit, which report shall include a copy of the examination papers

and statements of all the examinations held, &c."

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—I understand my hon. friend's point, and I will make an inquiry about it.

HON. MR. ALLAN, from the committee, reported the Bill, with amendments, which were concurred in.

CONSTITUTION OF THE TREASURY BOARD BILL.

SECOND READING.

Bill (104), "An Act to amend the sections of Acts therein mentioned, relating to the Constitution of the Treasury Board," was introduced from the House of Commons, and read the first time.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think the House will allow me to have the Bill read at length at the table. It is to add a member to the Treasury Board. The Treasury Board consists of the Ministers of Finance, Customs, Inland Revenue and Justice. It is proposed to add the Secretary of State and one other of the Ministers composing the members of the Privy Council. The Secretary of State is added, because he has charge of the Board of Examiners, and the Privy Council is empowered to choose another because it often happens that there is no French Canadian on the Board, and that gives rise occasionally to jealousy.

The Bill was read the second time at length at the table.

TEMPERANCE ACT AND LIQUOR LICENSE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

AMENDMENTS CONCURRED IN.

The Order of the Day having been called,

Committee of the Whole House on (Bill 92) The Canada Temperance Act 1878, and The Liquor License Act 1883, further Amendment Bill.

HON. MR. VIDAL said:—I have already, at an earlier period of to-day's sitting, intimated my intention of asking a postponement of this order. I think it would be convenient that my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Bellerose) should bring forward his motion for adjournment, because my proposition to postpone the consideration of these amendments depends a great deal on whether his motion succeeds or not. (No, no.) That being the case, I move that the order of the day be discharged, and that the amendments be taken into consideration to-morrow. (Now, now.)

HON. MR. POWER—I think it is unusual to refuse a trifling courtesy like this which is asked for by the hon. member from Sarnia.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I object to this motion, although objection has been alluded to as somewhat discourteous. I do not understand the relevancy of that remark with reference to a public bill, especially under the circumstances in which we are placed, having on the order of the day a notice of motion for to-morrow, which would have the effect of adjourning the House for ten or twelve days. Under the circumstances, it is very desirable—I speak of it now as a matter of public business—that this Bill should be disposed of one way or the other before the adjournment takes place. That is the starting point; otherwise, if it be left in an unfinished state, it will come on in the Greek Kalends, perhaps—at all events a fortnight hence, probably in the absence of gentlemen who would like to be here, and necessarily in a comparatively thin house. That is not desirable; and in regard to an important matter like this—I hope I am not speaking in an offensive way—it is trifling with the House to ask us, after the long delays which have occurred and after the full discussion which took place yesterday—and which might very properly have been terminated last night by a motion to concur in the amendments—to ask us to let this order stand for another day. The amendments have been fully discussed already, and there is no reason why the House should not concur in them now. As to the 3rd reading of the Bill, that is a matter which perhaps might well stand over until to-morrow; but, speaking of to-

morrow, we know what day of the week it is, and we know that on Friday many gentlemen—not myself or any of the members from the Maritime Provinces—take the opportunity of going home, leaving in the afternoon at an early hour, and it is not possible that these amendments could be taken into consideration and disposed of properly to-morrow. Under the circumstances I do say that if there ever was a case where a bill should be disposed of it is this. There is another reason. This is a measure which is in the hands of the House; it is a public bill which has been standing for weeks and weeks; it has been fully discussed and is thoroughly understood. On a former occasion, when an appeal was made to postpone it because of the absence of an hon. gentleman who was unable, through illness, to be here, I at once rose and, notwithstanding the murmurs of some of my friends, agreed to the postponement. My hon. friend stated to-day that he wished to have it postponed because of the absence of my hon. friend who sits below me, (Mr. Scott.)

HON. MR. VIDAL—That was one of the reasons.

HON. MR. DICKEY—That was the chief one.

HON. MEMBERS—It was the first one.

HON. MR. DICKEY—The appeal was made, and if the hon. member had not come into his place shortly afterwards there would have been some grounds for the appeal, but now that reason has vanished. The other ground was that the hon. gentleman wanted to consult certain members of another body. Really that is a ground which I will not exactly say is childish, but it is trifling with us to give such a reason, because my hon. friend knows very well that he has had an opportunity to confer with members in another place during the last 24 hours, and he knows very well that the only constitutional way of having intercourse on such subjects, after a Bill has arrived at this stage, is quite open to him, when the Bill comes back with the amendments accepted or rejected either in whole or part. These are the two grounds on which my hon. friend asked to have the matter postponed. I beg to move in amendment to his motion, that the House do concur in the amendments to the said Bill.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I think hon. gentlemen cannot have failed to observe the exceeding want of courtesy which has been manifested towards me on this occasion. I have not even had an opportunity allowed me to state the reasons why I wished this Bill postponed. The hon. member from Amherst without waiting to hear my explanation, rises and makes his statement, not even allowing me the common privilege of stating the ground on which I asked the House to assent to the proposal which I now make. I may be wrong in my judgment, but I think it is a want of courtesy in this House which has never before been displayed to any member who has had charge of an important bill, to which many amendments have been made—some of them important, and which are not now before us in such a way that we can deal intelligently with them—to refuse a postponement. We have not this bill with the amendments printed in it, and that is my principal reason for asking for this delay. For instance, I wish in connection with this matter to resist the motion for concurrence with one particular amendment, which was made in committee, and having no number attached I cannot designate it. There is no possibility for me to refer to it in giving the notice that I wish to give of moving that it be referred back to the committee to strike out the clause. Now, I think hon. gentlemen must concede that there is ample ground for the position which I take—that the important amendments which have been made should be printed in this Bill before we are asked to concur in them. It is true they are in our minutes, but if you read these minutes, they leave an impression on the mind that important changes have been made, but what the effect of them is we do not clearly know. I am asking, simply, the concession that we may have the Bill before us in such a shape that we may understand it. What are the amendments that I may feel it my duty to resist, I do not yet know. I do not propose to enter into any of those

matters which have been fully discussed; I merely propose to place a motion before the House, on which a vote may be recorded in our Journal: I want the country to know who they are that give respectful attention to the petitions which have been presented here, and who refuse to listen to them.

HON. MR. SMITH—They know well who it is.

HON. MR. VIDAL—No; they have no opportunity of knowing. The votes in committee are not recorded. I want the country to know who, among us, in the discharge of their public duties, turn a deaf ear to the prayers of the people. Another reason why I ask for a postponement is, with a view to facilitate the action of the House with reference to this matter. There are certain amendments made, and however improper it may seem to some hon. members, that I should have conference with members of the other House, I think it would be a wise and proper course to pursue. This Bill comes from the other House, where its friends and promoters are. If those promoters say that they accept these amendments, I will at once consent to their being concurred in, and a great deal of time may be saved. My expectation is that they will concur in all of them but one, and, if so, that will greatly expedite our dealing with the Bill. I think it a very proper request to make that I should have an opportunity to consult with them, especially when we know that the Bill has to go back to that House, and that by consulting with its friends there now, we may facilitate its passage by coming to an understanding on the subject. I present my request to the House to be allowed to postpone the consideration of these amendments until to-morrow. In saying so this afternoon, I prefaced my remarks by stating that I wished my hon. friend (Mr. Bellerose) to make his motion for an adjournment that I might know what the decision of the House was with reference to it. I honestly confess that should the House adopt that motion, my idea would be to let the matter stand over until we meet again. (No, no!) Well, I have no objection to either way, but that would appear to me to be the very best way to deal with it.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I must say I do not think it is necessary—

HON. MR. VIDAL—I have not yet concluded my remarks. The hon. gentleman is in a great hurry to oppose my request; he is fanatical in his oppositon to the Bill. I cast myself on the House, and I do not think the Senate will be so lacking in the courtesy which they usually extend to members in charge of important measures as to refuse my request.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The hon. member from Sarnia accuses me of fanaticism. I think if anyone displays fanaticism it is the hon. gentleman himself; he has not convinced me, and I do not think he has convinced the House, that there is any reason why the concurrence in these amendments should be postponed. I am quite willing that every one should have an opportunity to show how he votes on this matter. We have a full house to-day; the division in committee yesterday was 42 to 20; but my hon. friend would prefer to postpone the Bill until to-morrow because he knows that a good many members will then be away, or he would like to postpone it to a later date when there would be a thin House and he would have a chance to get his Bill through.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I deny it.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Any member can see the drift of the hon. gentleman's manœuvre.

HON. MR. POWER—Order, order.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It is a proper word to characterize it—I say it is a manœuvre to prevent a full vote being taken upon the Bill. I am not content to have the House placed in that position. He gave us two reasons why there should be a postponement; the first was that the leader of the Opposition was not present. That was settled by the appearance of the hon. gentleman from Ottawa in his place. Then he wanted to confer with members of the other House. Does not every one know that he is in continuous communication with members of the other House? I say it is not a proper reason to advance

to obtain a postponement of this Bill. Every important amendment to the Bill but one emanated from the hon. gentleman himself and those who act with him. There is nothing therefore which requires any great deliberation, and those of us who wish to put our views on record want to have the vote taken when there is a full House. We had last night probably as large a house as we have ever had here, and my hon. friend could not choose a better occasion to obtain an expression of opinion from the Senate on this important question. I am anxious to show the opinion of this House upon this iniquitous measure, and their opinion of the degradation which the temperance people are bringing upon the country by such legislation.

Hon. Mr. FLINT—I am surprised at the position taken by the hon. member from Lunenburg. He talks about fanaticism. I think that is a word which should not be used in an august assembly like this. I want to know what I am going to vote for, and when I take up the minutes of yesterday's proceedings and look through them, it is a moral impossibility for me to tell what I am going to vote for, with the exception of the amendment of the hon. member from Halifax. That is the reason why I should like to have the Bill re-printed with the amendments, so that we can see what we are going to vote for. I have been in this House ever since it was constituted, and I believe this is the first time that I have ever known, when a member having charge of a Bill desired to postpone it to a later day, such a request to be refused; but, of course, the opponents of the Bill are in the majority, and if they choose to put down the minority by insisting that they shall vote upon a question without quite understanding it, we must only submit; but the country will understand the position in which we are placed. I am not ashamed to record my vote on this question, nor is anyone else who advocates this measure. I cannot see any ground for objection to the proposal to postpone this order until to-morrow. We have no other work before us, and we can get through with it to-morrow as easily as we can to-day. I cannot record my vote intelligently on this Bill under the circumstances, and consequently I shall have to abstain from voting altogether. I am sorry to think that this important question should be treated in such a manner by the majority in this House. I was in hopes that we would have some useful amendments made to the Scott Act, but, instead of that, the very reverse has been done, because the amendment of the hon. member from Halifax renders the Bill useless. I do not care what the members of the other House are going to do, but I want to know what I am going to vote for. I have not the education of some hon. gentlemen here; for instance, the hon. member from Lunenburg; and I cannot understand what A, B, C, is for, unless I have something else to explain the letters; therefore, I cannot vote upon this Bill.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—Might not my hon. friend's object be attained in this way: He says the House is anxious to vote on this Bill; and it is very desirable that a vote should be taken on it when the House is full. Those who are opposed to the Bill, including myself, are just as anxious and ready to record their votes as the supporters of the Bill. Could not my hon. friend allow the amendments to be concurred in, and let the Bill stand for third reading to-morrow? He can then move that the Bill be not concurred in, but that such and such a thing be done. In that way he can move to strike out anything which he considers objectionable in the Bill, and attain all he desires, and, at the same time, a vote can be taken upon the amendments in a full House.

Hon. Mr. DIKEY—I am perfectly willing to adopt that plan.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—I really do not understand my position. I do not want the concurrence of the House in these amendments to go on record unopposed. My difficulty is that the particular amendment that I want to divide the House upon, I cannot designate. It is not clause number so and so, and it is not described in any documents before us. Some of the amendments made in committee, I do not object to; but there is one that I object to, and I cannot designate it.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—You can do it on the third reading.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—You can do it on the third reading without notice.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—There is very little doubt that the majority of the House is against the Bill, but I think the feeling expressed by a respectable portion of the House is, that the hon. gentlemen who ask for the postponement should not be refused their request.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I wish to repudiate the charge of any intention on my part to take advantage of the absence of any gentlemen who are opposed to this measure in calling on a vote on this Bill. I am willing, if it can be done by the amendment of my hon. friend from Amherst, to have the division taken and let it pass, with the understanding that I am not to be debarred from making my motion on the third reading of the Bill.

The House divided on the amendment, which was carried on the following division :—

CONTENTS :

Hon. Messrs.

Almon,	McKay,
Archibald,	McKindsey,
Baillargeon,	McMillan,
Bolduc,	Macfarlane,
Botsford,	Montgomery,
Boucherville de,	Nelson.
Campbell, (Sir Alex.),	Northwood,
Carvell,	Odell,
Clemow,	O'Donohoe,
DeBlois,	Ogilvie,
Dever,	Paquet,
Dickey,	Plumb,
Ferguson,	Read,
Glasier,	Robitaille,
Guévremont,	Ross,
Hamilton,	Smith,
Kaulbach,	Sutherland,
Lacoste,	Thibaudeau,
McDonald,	Turner.—38.

NON-CONTENTS :

Hon. Messrs.

Alexander,	McInnes,
Allan,	McMaster,
Armand,	Macdonald,
Chaffers,	Miller (Speaker),
Chapais,	Poirier,
Ferrier,	Power,
Flint,	Stevens,
Girard,	Trudel,
Grant,	Vidal,
Haythorne,	Wark,—22.
Leonard,	
McClelan,	

HON. MR. VIDAL moved that the Bill be read the third time to-morrow, and that it stand the first order of the day.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at six o'clock.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Friday, May 8th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

AN ADJOURNMENT.

MOTION.

HON. MR. WARK gave notice that he would move, on Monday next, that, when the House adjourns it stand adjourned until Wednesday, the 28th inst.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE moved that when this House adjourns to-day, it do stand adjourned until Wednesday, the 20th inst. He said : It is unnecessary to give the reasons for making this motion. The orders of the day show that there is no work for us after to-day, and there is no legislation coming up from the other House. One bill has occupied the time of that House for a week or ten days and, from what we can see, it is likely to occupy their time for some weeks to come. They only pass one or two clauses a week, and the probability is, when we return on the 20th inst., you will find them still debating the measure. Next week there will be two non-sitting days—Thursday and Saturday; that leaves only four sitting days next week. I have no objection to vote for the amendment of my hon. friend from Fredericton, to adjourn for a fortnight longer, because a week from Monday next will be the Queen's birthday celebration. However, as there are some members of this House who would probably object to

it on the ground that sufficient notice has not been given, I will merely move the motion which appears on the paper.

HON. MR. MCDONALD (C. B.)—When notice was given of this motion I thought it was not for a sufficiently long period to enable those of us who live in the Maritime Provinces to visit our homes. If the House would consent to an adjournment until the 26th or 27th of the month I do not think it would make any material difference, so far as the business of the session is concerned. Judging from appearances, we are not likely to have any business from the other House for three weeks to come. They have been several days debating the Franchise Bill, and they have only reached the 3rd clause; as the Bill contains 63 clauses altogether, we can imagine how long it will take to reach the end of it. If the House will adjourn until the 26th, we will lose only nine sitting days. If we meet on the 20th of the month there are only two more sitting days of that week. Then follow three non-sitting days, and therefore I think it would be much more convenient to adjourn until the 26th.

HON. MR. WARK—I did not give the notice because I thought the House should adjourn. I think that the important events which are transpiring in different parts of the Dominion, the troubles out in the North-West, and other events, would render it desirable that we should remain here, but if an adjournment is to take place, we who live a great distance from the Capital, and who have been here 100 days now, ought to have an opportunity to spend a few days at home. I therefore have named Monday as the day on which the motion should be offered. I believe that is the day on which the adjournment ought to take place. It will give the Government time to consider whether we are likely to have anything to do during the next two or three weeks. I am satisfied if the Bill before the other House is pressed, there is very little prospect of its passing sooner. It is likely to remain under discussion, and consequently, if that Bill is persevered in, and we have to adjourn, we might just as well adjourn until the 27th. I should like to know whether the Franchise Bill is likely to be persevered in to the exclusion of all other business; if it is, there can be no objection to the adjournment that I have suggested. I have named Wednesday, because it gives most of us an opportunity to remain at home over Sunday. I do not like the idea of adjourning at the end of a week, because those of us who live in the Maritime Provinces would have to spend Sunday on the way home.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Perhaps the Minister of Justice may be able to answer the question now.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am quite ready to give an answer now. When I saw the notice on the paper I considered it my duty to inquire, and I did make an inquiry as carefully as I could, whether the adjournment should take place. I believe the adjournment may take place, as proposed by the hon. member from DeLanaudiere, without any prejudice whatever to the public business. I think it would not be desirable to prolong the time more than that. My hon. friend. from Cape Breton says that we only lose, by the longer adjournment, two days in the week, Thursday and Friday, and that the Queen's birthday being celebrated on Monday, we probably should not meet on that day, and therefore it would not make much difference. It would make a difference of a week, and that perhaps might be inconvenient. I can only say, in answer to the hon. gentleman's question, that I believe the adjournment proposed by the hon. member from DeLanaudiere will not prejudice public business in any way.

HON. MR. WARK—It would be of no advantage to those who live a greater distance from the Capital. I move as an amendment that the House stand adjourned until Wednesday the 28th inst.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I object to the amendment, and I think it cannot be put. It could not be put as a substantive motion, and it cannot be put now as an amendment.

THE SPEAKER—It can be put only by the unanimous consent of the House.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Then I must oppose it, as I oppose the motion of

the hon. member from DeLanaudiere. We have a Bill before us which cannot, without great pressure, be put through to-day, and besides there are four or five other matters before the House, all requiring a great deal of consideration and deliberation. I believe also that other bills must necessarily come before us in a few days. There is one, especially, for the re-organization of the Library of Parliament. The hon. member from Woodstock was so anxious yesterday for that Bill to come up to us that he wanted to discuss it before it reached us. I think we have no right to anticipate the action of the House of Commons. If there is a delay, whether proper or otherwise, it is no reason why we should be relieved of our duties in this House. There is ample business before us, if properly considered and debated, to occupy all our time until further measures come up from the other Chamber. I certainly shall not allow this motion to pass without asking for a division upon it. We cannot get through the business before the House to-day; that is quite evident. I dare say the leader of the Government is quite ready to be relieved of the presence of gentlemen in this House, and I understand facilities have been offered to some members to go to their homes. I have had no intimation of it myself, but I understand that some members from the Maritime Provinces have been told that they could avail themselves of free passages over the Intercolonial Railway. If that is the case, the offer should not be confined to individual members, and I think it is a proper question to ask the leader of this House whether the Government railway, or any other railway, is to furnish free passes to members from the Maritime Provinces? If so it should be general. I do not care to ask the Department of Railways as a favor for a pass. I have never done so and I never shall; if any passes are being issued to members of the Senate we ought to be informed of it, and every member should be treated alike. I oppose the motion, because we are here to do the business of the country. Hardly a day passes that I do not receive communications on business which I have to submit to the Government or to the House. I believe that the session ought to be over by this time and that we should be at our homes. It is bad enough to be detained here such a length of time, but it would be worse still to go home for a few days and have to return again.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—This motion is brought before us by an hon. member from the Province of Quebec. We all understand that such a lengthened adjournment is either inspired or sanctioned by the leader of the Government in this House.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I wish to set the hon. gentleman right. I may tell him that when I gave notice of the adjournment, the Minister of Justice seemed to be opposed to it, and it was only because so many appeared to be in favor of it that he took the trouble to ascertain whether it could take place or not.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—At all events the leader of the Government in this House since the motion was first brought before us has shown how anxious he was to have it carried.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—He opposed it at first.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—At this late period of the session, and certainly at this eventful moment, an adjournment will not be approved of by the country. It will make this impression that the members of the Senate are not alive to their responsibilities. As the hon. member from Lunenburg has said we have no right to anticipate the action of the House of Commons.

HON. MR. ALMON—We anticipate their want of action.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—The First Minister may find immediately such an outburst of public indignation throughout the Province of Ontario with regard to that infamous Franchise Bill as will compel him to drop it.

THE SPEAKER—It is not in order for the hon. gentleman to introduce a discussion of this kind, and he knows it.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—We do not know but that on Monday or Tuesday

the First Minister may do as he did two days ago—suspend all further discussion of the Franchise Bill and go on with the business of the country and give us full employment. Between now and the 20th of this month the most momentous events may transpire in the North-West, and if so what will the public say when they learn that the members of the Senate, who can afford to give their time and services to the country, are away from their post? There are measures of the utmost consequence to come up before us this session; there is the question of further advances to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

HON. MR. POWER—That will not be here for some time.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—There are other questions besides, those relating to the finances of the country and the large amounts required to be raised in order to meet the public liabilities. It is not the object of my hon. friend from DeLanaudiere to prevent discussion, but it is the desire of the Government that there shall be as little debate as possible in this Chamber. What a sham it was, his moving the other day for the appointment of a joint committee to consider the best means of providing public business for this body. (Order, order).

THE SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman should observe the rules.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I will not refer to that extraordinary sham, but we certainly do desire that the measures which come up before the Senate should have due consideration here, and that they should not, as during past sessions, be brought before us within 48 hours of the end of the session, when there is not time for debating them, and we have to pass them, as a matter of form, just as they come from the Government who have brought so much disaster on the country.

HON. MR. O'DONOHOE—There are some hon. gentlemen whose homes are so far from the Capital that it is hardly possible for them to leave here and spend more than a day or two at home and return by the 20th.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B.C.)—There are some who cannot get home at all.

HON. MR. O'DONOHOE—I am sure that those gentlemen will not stay in the way of those hon. members who live nearer to the Capital, and who can reach home in a shorter time. I am quite sure that they will see the propriety of allowing everyone who can avail himself of the adjournment to do so. Why should they play the dog in the manger? I am sure they will not do it. The hon. member from Lunenburg says that some members are offered passes to go home to the Maritime Provinces. If such an offer has been made by any company, I venture to say that it is only the member from Lunenburg who has heard of it. My hon. friend also states that the public business demands that we should remain. The Minister of Justice tells us that the public business will not be prejudiced by this adjournment. Which authority shall we take—the hon. member from Lunenburg, or the leader of the Government in this House? Unless, indeed, a change has taken place, and my hon. friend from Lunenburg has a position in the Government that enables him to speak with authority to the Senate. I am quite sure that there is not a member of this House, however anxious he might be to go home, who would think of leaving the Capital if there was a prospect of any business coming before us within the period of the proposed adjournment. It is because there is no prospect of any business coming up that an adjournment has been proposed, and I trust that the House will see the propriety of allowing the largest number who can go home, to visit their families, and to take part, perhaps, in proceedings going on in relation to public affairs.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I consider that it would be far more becoming if this question of adjournment were debated upon other than personal grounds, as it is scarcely possible to meet the convenience of all hon. members. In my judgment, it is the lowest style of argument that can be adduced here, that of private convenience. For my part, I intend to vote against both propositions for adjournment, and to take a wider view of it. I concur

very much in the view of the hon. gentleman from Woodstock. It seems to me that the dignity of the Senate is concerned in keeping this body together, and that we should be in our places, ready for any contingency in public affairs that may arise. We are now at an important crisis in the affairs of the Dominion, a political crisis and a national crisis, and if these two objects united are not sufficient to keep hon. gentlemen in their places there is very little hope in doing so. The leader of the Government has stood up in his place and stated that there is no probability of any work coming up from the other House for some time. No doubt the Minister speaks to the best of his knowledge and belief, but it is not unlikely that events may occur in the Commons, or in the North-West Territories, that may make the united action of this Senate necessary, and what would the country think if the members of this House were dispersed all over the provinces, when their services were required in this Chamber? Another view of the case is that the regulations concerning the indemnity of senators are obviously framed with the intention of keeping members in their places until the close of the session, and we cannot, with impunity, override those regulations.

HON. MR. READ—It is quite evident that the leader of the Government would not have given his consent to the adjournment if he had reason to believe that the interests of the country would suffer by it. We have been here fourteen weeks; we have sat regularly, from 3 to 6, as a general thing, and have had three night-sittings; we have accomplished all the work that has come before us, and from present appearances we will have little more to do for some time to come. As to this "political crisis," referred to by the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island, I do not know where it is. I hope it will not arise very soon, but if it does we will be back here in time to take hold of any question that will require our consideration. In the meantime let us go home and see how the country feels on this important "political crisis."

HON. MR. FLINT—I am opposed to the adjournment. I have never voted for one of those adjournments since I have been in the Senate, and I cannot do so to-day. My hon. friend from DeLanaudiere, I look upon as the chairman of the standing committee of adjournments connected with the Senate, from the fact that he is the only person who ever moves an adjournment of the Senate. The Minister of Justice may feel that it is a very easy matter for him to give way under the circumstances, but it is not for me to say, because the Minister of Justice favors an adjournment, that I do.

THE SPEAKER—Under the objection raised by the member for Lunenburg, I consider the amendment is out of order. An amendment of this kind to be in order, must have notice of it given; an amendment extending beyond the notice would not be in order.

The House divided on the motion, which was carried on the following division:

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Allan,	McInnes,
Almon,	McKay,
Archibald,	McKindsey,
Armand,	McMaster,
Baillargeon,	McMillan,
Bellerose,	Macfarlane,
Bolduc,	Miller (Speaker),
Doucherville, de,	Montgomery,
Campbell (Sir Alex.),	Odell,
Carvell,	O'Donohoe,
Chaffers,	Ogilvie,
Chapais,	Pâquet,
Cormier,	Pelletier,
Clemow,	Plumb,
DeBlois,	Power,
Ferguson,	Read,
Ferrier,	Robitaille,
Girard,	Smith,
Glasier,	Stevens,
Guévremont,	Thibaudeau,
Howlan,	Trudel,
Lacoste,	Turner.
McDonald,	Vidal,—46.

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Alexander,	McClelan,
Dickey,	Macdonald,
Flint,	Nelson,
Grant,	Poirier,
Haythorne,	Sutherland,
Kaulbach,	Wark.—12.

THE SPEAKER—As no hour is mentioned in the motion, I will declare that the Senate, when it adjourns to-day, will

stand adjourned until the 20th instant, at three o'clock—at the usual hour.

HON. MEMBERS—Eight o'clock.

THE SPEAKER—It is too late now, without the unanimous consent of the House, to make it eight o'clock.

HON. MEMBERS — Make it eight o'clock.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE — As a matter connected with the question just now under discussion, it has been said in the corridors to-day that free passes over Government railroads are to be had for the asking by members going to their homes. I ask the Government whether such passes are to be given to all who wish to travel to their homes, or whether they are to be confined to a few? It is rather an unpleasant predicament for a gentleman who has bought his ticket to find that he is travelling in the same car with other hon. gentlemen who have free passes over the road.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am not aware what the rule is as to free passes; but I will take care, whatever the rule is, that it shall be made general.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AND LIQUOR LICENSE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING POSTPONED.

The order of the day having been called for the third reading of Bill (92) "An Act further to amend the Canada Temperance Act 1878, and the Liquor License Act 1883,"

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: I rise to ask the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill to postpone the third reading until after the adjournment. It seems to me that there would not be a full opportunity to-day to discuss the amendments which still remain to be made by the hon. gentleman from Glengarry, and the hon. gentleman from Halifax. The amendment proposed by my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Power) particularly is one which is of great importance, and which many members of this House think a very valuable one; therefore there should be time to discuss it, and to give my hon. friend who has proposed it an opportunity for developing his own arguments in favor of it, and time for others who are opposed to it, and who believe that it should not carry, to discuss it. I do not think that the Bill can be prejudiced by the postponement of the third reading, because the amendments which have been already made in committee have been concurred in, and the Bill stands with those amendments concurred in before the House. After the vacation, the House will probably assemble with very nearly its present strength, and the Bill will then stand as amended, and ample time will be given for the discussion of the further amendments that are proposed. I think that would be a more reasonable mode of disposing of this measure, and it could still go down in ample time to have our amendments discussed in the other branch of the legislature.

HON. MR. DICKEY—Before my hon. friend from Sarnia answers the appeal made to him, I rise to express my regret that the Minister of Justice has made this suggestion, because I think it will place several hon. members in a very, very awkward position; but if the appeal is to be entertained at all I think it is desirable that we should know now, as doubtless my hon. friend who has charge of the Bill is in a position to tell us, what portion of the amendments that have been concurred in he accepts, and what he rejects, so that we may know intelligibly when we come to discuss them hereafter. There can be no inconvenience in that course, because the question of the 3rd reading will not be taken up to-day, and it will simply be a question which of these amendments are to be agreed to, and which are to be opposed.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I am taken completely by surprise at the proposition which is now made to me. I cannot conceive what wonderful change has come over the Senate, which yesterday, when I asked one day's delay, treated me personally with great discourtesy, extending to me a treatment that has never before been extended by the Senate to any other gentleman,

refusing me a postponement for 24 hours for the concurrence in those amendments asked, in order that I might ascertain the very points that my hon. friend now asks me to speak on, and to say which of those amendments I would concur in and which I would resist. The House would not give me the time, and would not even give me the Bill re-printed with the amendments, but insisted that the measure should be pushed on and disposed of, The House has thus taken the matter out of my hands, leaving me entirely powerless and I shall not condescend to ask the House for any indulgence whatever in respect to this matter; I have no reason to expect any, when the common courtesy was denied me yesterday that has always been extended to any other member in making a similar request; I am quite prepared to go on and take the third reading of the Bill, but, of course, the matter is in the hands of the House.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am sorry that the hon. gentleman does not accept the suggestion in a better spirit, as some of his friends were very anxious to-day that the Bill should be postponed. I had a message to-day from the hon. gentleman who usually sits at the head of the room, begging me in very earnest terms to postpone this measure until after the vacation; and now, when I make the suggestion, my hon. friend meets it in a spirit that surprises me very much. My idea is that the Bill ought to be postponed. I am anxious, myself, to justify to the House and to the country, the course which I propose to take in reference to this amendment. It could hardly be done this afternoon; hon. gentlemen are going away, and it seems to me that in a matter of this kind it would be more convenient to postpone the third reading; it will do no harm, if my hon. friend does not oppose it.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I do not condescend to oppose it; it is in the hands of the House.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Perhaps my hon. friend may feel a little sore because of what took place yesterday. It is not a matter of condescension; he is not prevented from taking any step that he could have taken yesterday on any of those amendments which are proposed; they can be discussed and voted upon hereafter, just as thoroughly as if time had been given yesterday, so I think my hon. friend feels a little too sore on the course which was taken by the House yesterday in this matter. I, myself, think it is an honor to address the House instead of a condescension, and as I will have some remarks to make on the question, I therefore move that the third reading of the Bill be postponed until Thursday, May 21st inst.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I did not say it is a condescension to address the House; but it is a condescension to ask a favor of the House.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am sorry that the proposition has been made by the Minister of Justice, because I believe we have a fuller House now than we will have after the adjournment.

HON. MR. FLINT—I was very anxious yesterday and the day before that the matter should be postponed for a time; I thought it would be better to have the Bill re-printed with the amendments in it, so that we could understand what we are voting for. I certainly, as I stated in my place yesterday, could not understand how those amendments stood, and although I would not be willing to second the motion to adjourn the third reading, I certainly should not object to it. I do not think the Bill will lose anything by postponing its consideration until the House meets again. I think, in all probability, it will be the best thing that can be done. My hon. friend from Sarnia felt a little sore, as I did myself, in reference to the treatment we had received, because I do not think we were deserving of it. I think that we should have been treated in a more courteous manner. As it is I am willing to extend mercy to those who showed no mercy to us yesterday. It will be recollected that at the time the member from Amherst saw fit to withdraw his motion for the three months hoist, the Minister of Justice suggested that we should allow the Bill to go into committee, and that the speeches could be made on the third reading. I rose to ask if that was the case, and stated if so I had some

remarks to make on it which I would reserve until that stage. As a matter of fact the speech I intended to make on it I have kept in abeyance. However, I am quite willing to postpone what I have to say for the convenience of members who wish to delay the 3rd reading of the Bill until after the adjournment.

HON. MR. ALMON—I rise, not so much to speak to this motion as to do justice to the senior member for Halifax. He told me this afternoon that because of illness in his family he was obliged to go home immediately, and he asked me to move the amendment which he has prepared, on the third reading. In my remarks yesterday I rather alluded to him disparagingly, thinking that he had no serious intention of moving the amendment, because he had not done it on two occasions that I thought had offered. His conduct has shown that he was in earnest, and I beg leave to retract what I said against him on the matter.

HON. MR. MCCLELAN—I thought that the request made by the hon. member from Sarnia yesterday was a very proper one under the circumstances, to enable him to maturely consider the amendments which had been made in committee. The delay which he asked for was not an unreasonable delay, and, with him, I am very much surprised to-day that a different idea is manifested altogether, and the opinion is expressed that a long delay should take place for the consideration of these amendments which have been on the notice paper, and of which we are quite as well apprised as we were of the others. Of course it is a question of very great importance. It is so considered, I am sure by this honorable House from the interest which hon. gentlemen seem to have taken in promoting the amendments which have already carried. It is a question in which all parts of the country are interested, and a great many good citizens have petitioned Parliament concerning it. One can readily understand the very keen interest that is taken in the question throughout the country. I think the delay until after the adjournment will be prejudicial. It will be another one of those steps which are so well calculated to defeat the objects of the petitioners, and impair the efficiency of the Scott Act. If the Act is to be made useful at all to restrict the liquor traffic, the sooner the accepted amendments pass in this House and are sent to the House of Commons, and the sooner it will become fully known what is the result of them, the better it will be for all parties concerned in the proper administration of the law. If it is to be delayed at this stage until the concluding week of the session, the effect may be to impede and interfere with the securing of such legislation as will make the laws which we have more effective. If, for instance, this Bill had a third reading today, and was sent to the House of Commons, Parliament would know, and the country would know, exactly what will and what will not be concurred in, and there would be time left then for certain other proceedings to be taken. Another bill might be introduced and carried through, or such action taken as would supply any defects that are found to exist in the Act; but if the legislation is to be delayed further by postponing the third reading of the Bill, and the sending of it to the other branch of the legislature, there will be no time allowed for further action. It will be too late in the session then to institute other legislation *de novo*, and the result may be that those who are friendly to the Temperance Act would be put in a much worse position than they otherwise would be if this Bill were to receive its third reading now. The tactics of the Government, and the majority of the Senate, are, however, in accord, and the minority must submit.

HON. MR. DICKEY—After the reference that has been made to me by the hon. gentleman from Sarnia, it can hardly be expected that I should remain silent. This matter has got into a curious complication by the gentlemen who support the Bill being so anxious to push it on. I am one of those who oppose the Bill with the amendments; but the amendments having carried, I am most desirous that the Bill should receive every facility for being carried through, and in that respect I stand alongside of the hon. gentleman from Hopewell, because I am against the postponement of the third reading. At the same time I am not prepared to take the responsibility of dividing the House

upon it. I wish, however, to give no uncertain sound as to the impropriety of postponing it. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill, and who was so anxious for postponing it yesterday, is not prepared to say whether he is for or against the motion to postpone it to-day. But the hon. gentleman spoke on a former occasion in very much the same strain as he did to-day, and I thought my hon. friend, at that moment, was under some little excitement—excitement arising no doubt from a very proper cause; but I did not think it wise to say anything. I thought it better to let it pass. But my hon. friend has renewed the matter to-day, and it is necessary, on behalf of the majority of the House, that I should notice what he has said. He has charged us with discourtesy. I fail to see where the discourtesy comes in. The application was that the amendments which had been agreed to by large majorities, on the day previous, should be concurred in. The hon. member stated that it was discourtesy, because he was not allowed a day more to consider them. These amendments were upon the paper a week or ten days before they were considered by the House at all, everyone of them except one, and that, as I stated when it was moved, an unimportant amendment. In that opinion I was fortified by the opinion of the Minister of Justice. With that exception every one of them was on the paper, and how my hon. friends from Belleville and Sarnia can say that they do not understand them or know what they mean, and could not read the Bill with them, I cannot comprehend. That was the situation. The amendments were there. They were agreed to on one day, and my hon. friend who had charge of the Bill, had the whole of that evening and the next day, until the meeting of the House, to confer with his friends, if he desired to do so. He has not told us yet which of these it is he does not understand. He will not rise to-day and respond to my appeal to tell the House which of these amendments he concurs in, and which he rejects. I wish him to understand distinctly that, so far as delay is concerned, it is not on our part. I think I can speak for the gentlemen who voted for these amendments, when I say that they are most anxious that they should be disposed of now. So anxious were we that there should be no delay that I, at all events, was one who stated distinctly that we were quite willing that the hon. gentleman who has complained of discourtesy should have the same opportunity of moving to-day with regard to these amendments as he had yesterday. He can move as he pleases before the third reading, that any of those amendments can be struck out. There is no doubt about that. Therefore there is no injustice done; and, on reflection, my hon. friend can hardly say that he has been discourteously treated, when we only ask that the amendments, which were adopted by a large vote of the House, should be concurred in. He has had the opportunity ever since; he has it now, to say whether he objects to any or all of the amendments, but at the same time I agree with a great deal of what my hon. friend on my right, from Albert, says, that there is a great deal of inconvenience in this course, and I am surprised that my hon. friend has not stated whether he agrees or disagrees with the suggestion that has been made. That suggestion was as great a surprise to me as it was to him. It is contrary to my feelings; I should rather have the matter disposed of now. At the same time, as the leader of the Government has suggested the postponement, and as the hon. member from Sarnia is not prepared to say that he is opposed to it, what position am I left in? I have nothing more to say, except to express my dissent.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—There seems to be a good deal of difference of opinion with reference to this question, and it is a matter of indifference to me whether it is decided now or postponed. I cannot help thinking that if the postponement has any influence at all, it will be to the advantage of the hon. gentlemen who support this Bill. The hon. member from Belleville thinks that on the whole it will be advantageous to postpone the Bill. The hon. member from Albert is of the other opinion, and the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill has not given any opinion at all; therefore, we are at a loss to decide, from this conflicting testimony, whether it is better to go on with the Bill or not. I regret that the hon. gentleman

from Sarnia has seen fit to characterize the treatment which he has received at the hands of a majority of this House as a discourtesy. I think it was the desire of the House last night that the Bill should be put in a position to be discussed to-day on the third reading, and my hon. friend was assured that he would have a full opportunity of making any motion he pleased, and discussing the Bill at as great length as he deems advisable. I agree with the suggestion that it is desirable to postpone the third reading of the Bill until after the recess, inasmuch as the hon. member from Halifax is not present, and it is well that he should be here to give his views on the subject. He stands in the position of the quasi leader of the Opposition, and it is desirable that we should know the exact grounds on which he is moving his amendment. I think, on the whole, the hon. member from Sarnia and the hon. member from Albert, have nothing to complain of if this Bill is postponed until the next meeting of the House. A day is fixed so that members can be here, if they wish, to take part in the debate. I trust that there will be a full House and a full discussion on the Bill, so that those who support it will have an opportunity to express their views, and take such a course as, under Parliamentary rules, they may think best, to carry out their wishes on this question. We, who favor the amendments, have no desire to do anything which will thwart the machinery which works the Scott Act; but we have the right, when a Bill is brought here, to make amendments to that Act, to discuss it; and every time a Bill of this kind is brought before us, they must expect similar discussions to take place. They ought to receive it in good part, and if they will receive it in the kindly spirit the majority have manifested towards them, there will not be so much irritation, or so much difficulty, on the part of the hon. gentleman, in getting a favorable consideration of his measure.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I do not intend to reply to the hon. member from Amherst in detail. I still adhere to the statement which I made. It is a statement not made under the influence of excitement, but on the calm reflection I have been able to give it since last evening. It must remain in this way, that with respect to that question there is a difference of opinion between us. He adheres to his opinion and I adhere to mine. Only I state this fact; turn to the history of this Senate since its origin, and you will not find any other instance in which a member has been treated in the way I have been treated with reference to this Bill. Now, that is the fact, and you can draw any inference from it you please. I wish to make the *amende honorable* to my hon. friend from Lunenburg. I entirely misapprehended yesterday his action and his words; I thought he was interrupting me and endeavouring to put me down. I have ascertained that I was entirely in error in that supposition, and I wish frankly and fully to make the *amende honorable.*

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am sure that it is accepted as fully as it is offered.

The motion was agreed to.

CONSTITUTION OF THE TREASURY BOARD BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of Bill (104) "An Act to amend the sections of Acts therein mentioned relating to the constitution of the Treasury Board."

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of Bill (31) "An Act to amend and consolidate the Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883 and 1884."

He said:—I promised yesterday to inform the hon. gentleman from. Halifax, who is not now in his seat, why the words "nor until he received the certificates required" were omitted from sub-section A of clause 10. That sub-section is as follows —

"All appointments to the civil service shall be during pleasure, and no person shall be

appointed or promoted to any place below that of of a deputy head unless he has passed the requisite examination and served the probationary term hereinafter mentioned."

The words were omitted because it sometimes happens that delays take place in the granting of certificates, delays owing to the number of persons who have passed, and sometimes certificates have not yet been given. The meaning is preserved, because the appointment cannot take place unless the candidate has passed ; but whether he gets his certificate, that is the absolute paper itself, before or after his appointment is a matter of little consequence. As it is not necessary to insist on that, the words are omitted, but the meaning is there. I promised the hon. gentleman from Amherst to consider a suggestion which he made, that the list of the successful candidates placed before Parliament should disclose the precise position of each candidate—that is, that the grade of each clerk should be shown on the list. I have made the inquiry which I promised my hon. friend to make, and I must still repeat the hope that he will not insist on his suggestion, for the reason I then gave. It would place the persons who have passed in an invidious position. It would increase the difficulties of the Government inasmuch as the competitive system has not been adopted. It would cause a sense of injustice in the mind of the man who obtained the greatest number of marks if he did not receive the first appointment, so I hope my hon. friend from Amherst will not insist on that. The information which it would give can be obtained indirectly under clause 58. The papers laid on the table of the House might, if gentlemen chose to go closely into them, disclose the precise condition of the candidate ; and if it became necessary, in consequence of any abuse, to have the exact paper which he speaks of laid before Parliament, an address from either House would procure it, because the Government is aware of the grade which each candidate has obtained. I promised the hon. member from Prince Edward Island to prepare an amendment which would have the effect of placing at the disposal of each candidate the answers which he has made to the questions. On inquiry, I find that it is desirable that the original answers should be retained in the Department, because they constitute the only explanation or justification of the examiners ; but there is no reason why the candidate should not have a copy of the answers which he has given, and I hope the hon. member from Prince Edward Island will consider this amendment sufficient to meet the necessity which he suggests. The amendment which I propose as a sub-section of 34, will read thus :

Any candidate who shall have attended at any examination held under this Act shall, upon application to the Secretary of the Board of Examiners, made within three months from the date of such examination, and upon payment therefor at a rate to be fixed by Order of the Governor-in-Council, be entitled to obtain a copy of the answers given by him at such examination.

This will give him the information which he desires, and will still leave his original answers in the hands of the examiners for their justification for the course which they have pursued with reference to that candidate. If the original papers were given up, perhaps the candidate, having them in his hands, might so alter them as to show that the examiners had been wrong in their estimate of the strength of his examination. I will move therefore, that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that this clause be added and form sub-section 2 of section 34.

HON. MR. DICKEY—As the House may not exactly remember the opposed amendment suggested by me, I will call their attention to what passed in the committee on that subject as the foundation for the action which I propose to take here. On the reading of clause 34, which is as follows :—

"Immediately after each examination, a list of the persons who are found qualified shall be made out, and published in the *Canada Gazette*."

I proposed to add this : "showing the grading of the candidates on such examinations and a similar list shall be laid annually on the tables of both Houses of Parliament within 15 days after the opening of each session." That was the suggestion which I made at the time and I did not desire to move it adversely to the Bill, but it was not entertained for a mo-

ment. It was treated as a thing that could not be done—out of the question.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think I said I would make an inquiry.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I will come to that; I gracefully subsided. Then the hon. member from Halifax, who has made a good many objections to the Bill, did not seem to think there was anything in it, and the consequence was the section passed. Then we came down to the end of the Bill. I had not read it, for the reason that it was a consolidating Act and I desired to take it very much on the credit of the authors of it; but when we came down to the 58th clause I found, to my astonishment, the very thing enacted that in the last branch of that amendment I asked for. That 58th clause provides:

> The Secretary of State shall lay before Parliament, within fifteen days after the commencement of each session, a report of the proceedings of the Board of Examiners under this Act during the preceding year, which report shall include a copy of the examination papers, a statement of all examinations held, and of the number of candidates at each, and the names of the successful candidates, and also the rules and regulations made during the year under the provisions of section five of this Act:
>
> 2. The Secretary of State shall lay before Parliament in like manner a return of the names and salaries of all persons appointed to or promoted in the Civil Service during the said year, specifying the office to which each has been appointed or promoted.

But the Bill does not stop there, because in the next clause it provides something further which was perhaps equally necessary. Clause 59 is as follows:—

> The Secretary of state shall cause to be printed each year a list, to be called the Civil Service List of Canada, of all persons employed in the several departments of the Civil Service, together with those employed in the two Houses of Parliament, upon the first day of July last preceding, showing the dates of their several appointments and promotions, their age, rank in the service, and salary; and shall lay the same before Parliament within the first fifteen days of each session.

Now this Act was well drawn and well guarded, and it proposes a good deal more than I suggested, and indeed something that I had not thought of at the moment, but it left out any reference to the order of merit, and therefore I proposed to amend that 58th section when attention was called to it, by adding, after the words "and the names of the successful candidates," these words: "in the order of merit," so that the public might know who stood at the top of the list. No answer has been made to the suggestion upon that point at all, except this, that it would be inconvenient for the Government.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—And invidious to the candidates.

HON. MR. DICKEY—Why should it be any more invidious to candidates because the order of merit is stated and the man who is at the top of the list on an examination, shall stand at the top of the list as published; why should that be any more invidious to these gentlemen than it is to see, as we all have seen in the London *Times*, the names of, perhaps, hundreds of young men with their different marks?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—But there they act on the competitive system.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I am speaking now of the invidious distinction.

HON. SIR CAMPBELL—It is not invidious in that case. If the man at the head of the list succeeds there is nothing wrong then.

HON. MR DICKEY—Where does the invidiousness come in?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Because the man at the head of the list does not always succeed.

HON. MR. DICKEY—Why should the members of parliament not have an opportunity of seeing who are appointed and who are not, especially when the very next clause requires the Government to furnish a list of the people employed to be laid before Parliament? What they want is to ascertain who have been selected out of those lists of successful candidates. If they are to have that information, why should they not know who stood at the head of the list and who stood at the foot, and what is there invidious about it after

all? When young men come up for examination they know that they cannot all be first. Some must be last; some at the middle, and some at the top. I do not see that there is any reason in the objection that has been given. I have no desire to interfere with the Bill if other hon. members do not see it in the same light. I confess, I was a little astonished when my proposition would not be entertained for a moment at the time I made it; but when it was found at the foot of the Bill, my hon. friend said he would consult the Department whether the words I suggested should be added. I see no reason why they should not be added, but I leave the matter in the hands of the House.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think there is great force in the objection of the hon. Minister to the suggested amendment. Unless the competitive examination would secure the appointment of the candidate at the head of the list, you would not find young men willing to come up for exam ination at all. As I urged yesterday, it does not follow that because a man stood at the head of the list at one examination it would show his relative position to the whole list of persons who passed the examination. It would be unfair, therefore, and no proper conclusion could be drawn from it. Unless all the candidates who passed at the different examinations were thoroughly graded the list would be worthless. You could not tell at all how they stood on the list. So long as the Government have the right to choose from among the successful candidates, such as they think proper to appoint, there is no object in publishing a list such as that indicated by the hon. member from Amherst; and, as I stated before, it does not follow that because a man is at the head of the list in an examination that therefore he is the best qualified for appointment. Therefore, I cannot agree with the hon. member from Amherst, whose views I generally endorse.

HON. MR. WARK—There is one expression in that amendment that I do not approve of—that is, that these young men should pay the expense of getting copies. I think that copies should be furnished to them without any charge. It will cost the Government nothing to furnish them. They can set one of their clerks to make out the return and hand it to the young man.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The cost would not be great, but I think it is desirable that there should be some charge so that they may not ask for copies from mere caprice, to justify them and to show that the examiners were wrong. I do not think any candidate should object to paying a small sum for a copy.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was then read the third time and passed.

CANNED GOODS BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (U), "An Act respecting Canned Goods." He said: This is a Bill which I have introduced at the request of the Minister of Inland Revenue. It proposes to take some additional precautions by having the name and address stamped on the packages, and providing a penalty for violation of the Act, and to give standard sizes for packages.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B.C.)—I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the 3rd clause of the Bill. It says:—

"The Governor-in-Council may declare certain sized packages to be the standard size; and after the publication in the *Canada Gazette* of the Order-in-Council establishing such standard size, every person who places on any package containing goods or articles, in respect of which such standard size has been so established, and which package does not correspond with the standard size, any label, stamp or mark, purporting to specify the quantity or weight of the contents or the size of the package, shall incur a penalty of twenty-five cents for each package in respect of which the provisions of this section have been violated."

I should like to know what is to be the standard size? If it is a certain size different from what we have in British Columbia—I am speaking now specially of the salmon canning establishments of our province—it may affect plant to the extent of probably half a million of dol-

lars. I think it would be an improvement to the clause, and I cannot see that any injustice would be done, if the quantity contained in each can was marked upon it—if it was compulsory that the quantity in the can could be stated, no matter what the size. It is true that most of the cans out there contain one pound; some of them are put up in two pound cans. That would be better than fixing a standard size. I am afraid that the Bill will interfere materially with the plant in the large canning establishments of British Columbia, which have been in operation for the last ten or twelve years.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am glad that my hon. friend has called my attention to the subject, because it will give me an opportunity of conferring with the Minister of Inland Revenue, and I will be in a better position to deal with the question when it comes before a committee of the whole House.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—The Bill does not require that the weight shall be stated on the can, but where the weight is stated on the can, a penalty is prescribed if it does not come up to the weight. I think that is the provision.

Hon. Mr. TURNER—The Bill, as I understand it, is merely permissive. I have taken a good deal of interest in it and consulted with the Minister. One great difficulty in reference to the matter is that by putting the weight on you are bound to have it that weight. Fixing standard sizes gets over the difficulty.

Hon. Mr. McINNES—How so?

Hon. Mr. TURNER—Because it is permissive. He need not put the weight on the can unless he likes, but when he puts the weight on it must be there.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY — We found a great difficulty in having the weight put on the cans before. The matter was pressed very much on the House, but it was over-ruled, and the Bill passed in such a way that inconvenience resulted, which it is proposed to remedy now. That being the case, I am very glad that attention has been called to the point. It had not escaped my notice, and I hope it will be considered in the committee, especially in the light of the experience we have had in the past.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

PRISONERS' EMPLOYMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that Bill (87), "An Act to amend the Act intituled, 'An Act to provide for the employment without the walls of common gaols, of prisoners sentenced to imprisonment therein,'" be read the second time at length at the table. He said: This is a Bill to enable prisoners who are confined in common gaols to be employed at hard labor outside of the walls. It seems that now, if they are sentenced to hard labor, it must be found for them within the walls of the prison.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—I am very glad that this Bill has been introduced; I have seen the necessity for it. In Nova Scotia some prisoners have thought that, when sentenced to hard labor, it must be hard labor within the walls of the prison, and I think that they are right. The Bill will have the effect of a deterrent to crime, because prisoners sentenced to hard labor will be exposed to the public gaze. This hard labor to which prisoners are sentenced under the existing law, is never done, and the imprisonment is often injurious to their health. This Bill will not only act as a deterrent to crime, but it will prove beneficial in other directions.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read at length at the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (118), "An Act further to amend the Acts relating to weights and measures."—Sir Alex. Campbell.

Bill (V), "An Act respecting the Administration of Justice and other matters in the North-West Territories."—Sir Alex. Campbell.

Bill (W), "An Act respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilizers."—Sir Alex. Campbell.

The Senate adjourned at 5 o'clock.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Wednesday, May 20th, 1885.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at eight o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

There being no business upon the order paper, the Senate adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, May 21st, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (80), "An Act to incorporate the Fort McLeod Ranche Telegraph Co." (Mr. Girard).

Bill (76), "An Act to amend the Acts respecting the London Life Insurance Co." (Mr. Vidal.)

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING POSTPONED.

The order of the day having been called, for the third reading of Bill (92), "An Act further to amend 'the Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' and 'the Liquor License Act, 1883,"

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the order of the day be discharged, and that it be made the first order for Tuesday next.

HON. MR. SCOTT said he thought it was desirable to have the Bill printed, with the amendments, and it was difficult even to get the copy of the Bill as it was sent to the Senate.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL quite agreed with the hon. gentleman, and hoped that the Speaker would give the order to have the Bill printed.

HON. MR. ALMON—The Bill should be printed as amended, as I see it has been stated in some of the meetings recently held that the amendment permitting the sale of ale and light wines did not provide that they should be under any degree of strength, and it was considered that "light wines" is a term that might embrace any liquor, whereas it is distinctly stated in the amendment that they shall be under a certain degree of strength. It is evident that the public do not understand the amendment.

HON. MR. VIDAL gave notice that on the third reading he should move to strike out the amendment permitting the sale of ale and light wines.

The motion was agreed to, and the order was discharged.

PRISONERS' EMPLOYMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the 3rd reading of Bill (87), "An Act to amend the Act 40 Victoria, Chapter 36, intituled: 'An Act to provide for the Employment without the walls of Common Gaols, of Prisoners sentenced to imprisonment therein.'"

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

CANNED GOODS BILL.

REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (U), "An Act respecting Canned Goods."

IN THE COMMITTEE.

On clause 2, sub-section 2,

HON. MR. POWER asked for an explanation.

HON. MR. TURNER—The object of the sub-section is that fruit dried this season, and soaked the next and put in tins, it is provided that such cans shall be labelled or stamped with the word "soaked," so as to show what they really are.

The clause was agreed to.

On the third clause,

HON SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: This section relates to the standard size of packages, the object being to fix a standard, and to make it contrary to law to put any label upon any package of canned goods asserting that it is of that standard unless it is really so. I do not think, however, that the expression in the clause is very well adapted to carry out that meaning, and I propose to amend it so as to carry out the object intended.

HON. MR. POWER—I think the hon. Minister might have done well for the people who have to construe this clause if he had re-cast it altogether. It is very clumsily worded. It says that the Governor-in-Council may declare certain sized packages to be the standard size. That is an incorrect expression to begin with, because a package may be declared to be of the standard size, or they may fix certain dimensions for packages; then, after the publication in the *Canada Gazette* of the Order-in-Council establishing such standard size, "every person who places on any package containing goods or articles in respect of which such standard size has been so established, &c." Now, the standard size is not established as to the goods or articles; it is established as to the packages. I do not suppose that any mistake may occur from it, but the clause appears to have been drawn very hurriedly in the other chamber.

HON. MR. SCOTT—As I read this Bill, it does not appear to be contemplated to make this standard compulsory; it is still open to every one to put up goods in any sized can or package they please, provided they do not mark it a particular standard unless it be so. It appears to me it would be a more simple one, and one more satisfactory to the public, and I dare say not unsatisfactory to the packer, if it were declared that the goods should be put up in proportions of one pound, two pounds, four pounds, as the case might be—regular quantities—and that that should be the standard, because this Act will naturally be evaded. A man will have a tin that is very near the size of a six pound tin, for instance, but it does not contain six pounds; it is perhaps half a pound short. He does not put a label on it that it is warranted six pounds, but it is really sold as a six-pound can without having this mark of guarantee. It is recognized amongst the trade that there is a specific quantity for each can, and no well-established house thinks of putting up goods with a fraction over. The cans are graded as a rule—one pound, two pounds, three pounds, and so on—and not any broken quantity or fraction, and it would be very much simpler if we required, after a certain date, that all these cans should be put up in fixed quantities, and not in fractions of pounds, and then it would not be necessary to have the Governor-in-Council establish a standard, and it would apply to all manufacturers alike, whether they put on the mark or not. It seems to me that we are inviting a clear evasion of the law, because we are only proposing to punish parties where they practically decide not to name the standard—that the can does not contain the quantity provided for in the proclamation. I think the Bill is really an excellent one, and it would be much more simple and perfect and harmonious if we adopted the simple rule of having those goods put up, after a certain time, in round quantities.

HON. MR. TURNER—The Act of last year just called for what the hon. member from Ottawa has stated, but it was found to be impracticable. Fruit put up this year, for instance, if it is a good year, and fruit put up next year may be very different in weight, and this standard size is suggested by the merchant as well as by the manufacturer instead of measure by weight. It is found to be utterly impossible to put up goods one year the same weight as the same class of goods put up another year, and the remedy suggested is to adopt a standard of size instead of a standard of weight. There is one thing I would like to suggest to the Minister and that is the words "and each which package does not correspond with the standard size," should be changed to "and which package is less than the standard size."

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—Would it not be necessary to have the weight and quality of the stuff stamped on the label as well as the size?

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I think the hon. gentleman is quite right in that. The object of this bill, as I understand, is this, that the Government may have authority to declare a standard size, and that a party putting up goods under this standard size shall put his name on it, and shall put his stamp on it, and the weight whether it is two pounds, three pounds, or five pounds. If on examining those stamps, for instance, a tin is stamped three pounds, and it is found to be only two pounds and four ounces, then the party is subject to a fine. It is very important that the label shall specify the weight and contents.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—If there is no weight stamped on the can there is no penalty for light weight.

HON. MR. POWER—In section four there is a provision for weight.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I know, at the present time, tomatoes, green corn, fish and all those things are notoriously short in weight when compared with the label. A two-pound can seldom contains more than a pound and a-half, or one pound and three quarters, and a four-pound can rarely exceeds three and a-half or three and three-quarter pounds.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Is not this provided for in the next clause ?

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—Suppose the packer does not mark the weight on the can at all, he does not come under the penalty.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There may be some practical difficulty in marking the weight.

HON. MR. TURNER—The theory of marking the weight on the label is right, but in practice it is thoroughly wrong. The only plan by which this matter can be arranged is simply by providing a standard size for the package, and keeping to that size, and then preventing it from being interfered with. The Bill of last year contains the very clause that is now suggested respecting weight, and it was found to be wholly unworkable, and this repeals the Act of last year and puts it in a workable shape.

HON. MR. SMITH—It has been found that, in putting up tomatoes, and even salmon, it is impossible to put the same quantity always in the same sized can, and if you provide that there must be one pound weight in a package which is supposed to be a pound, it will sometimes be short a quarter of an ounce, and any crank that wants to take advantage of the packer or seller could do so. They have found in the United States, that the proper way is for every factory to put their stamp on the package—ones, twos and threes, as the case may be—and sell them from the factory, such a packer, according to the number, and they find it to be the best way. You cannot, in all cases, get the cans to weigh alike.

HON. MR. DEVER—Make them large enough.

HON. MR. SMITH—Make them large enough, and the packers will put the full weight in them, and the goods will sell according to the character of the packer and the marks. Say, there are 20,000 cans now made for a certain weight, and if they are a quarter of an ounce less than that weight they would have to be thrown away. They find it impossible to have the weight exact, and, therefore, it is better for the whole community to have a standard size for packages. In the United States, they have got back to this very principle, and it is better to leave the Bill without providing a standard weight, as every packer will have his character and standing at stake in putting in the right weight.

HON. MR. TURNER—There is a bill now before the New York Legislature of the very same character as this. They have ceased to attempt to carry out what is impossible, and have adopted this very principle.

The clause was adopted.

On the fourth clause,

HON. MR. POWER—There is a provision in this clause that a variation of

half an ounce in each pound shall not be deemed a violation of the provisions of the section. Some articles are put up in very small packages.

HON. MR. SMITH—There is nothing put in less than one pound in those cans.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—In clause three the Governor-in-Council may declare a standard size.

HON. MR. TURNER—There are no goods of this kind put up in less than one pound packages.

HON. MR. SMITH—This applies to mustard as well as other canned goods, and under this clause you cannot import mustard.

HON. MR. POWER—The sixth section exempts foreign goods imported into Canada from the operation of the Act.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—If I understand the hon. gentleman, this is a Bill not to conform the size of packages, but on the contrary to conform the weights.

HON. MR. TURNER—It is only permissive.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—The Bill provides that the Governor-in-Council may declare certain sized packages to be the standard size for canned goods. These are called standard sizes. The next feature of it is that the man who packs the goods shall put his name on the package and after that he shall stamp on it the number of pounds contained in the package.

HON. MR. TURNER—He may do it or not, as he pleases.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—If he does, and the number of pounds in the can do not compare with the number on the label, he is liable to a fine. If he does not have a stamp on the package, he is liable to a fine ; and in certain cases he is allowed a variation of half an ounce. Now, if the packer is not compelled to stamp the weight on the can, and it is short in weight, he cannot be fined.

HON. MR. TURNER—The packer is not compelled to stamp the weight on the can, but if he does stamp it, and the weight is short, he is liable to a fine. The English law is this: you can buy a package unmarked as a package, but if it is stamped as weighing two pounds, and it does not contain two pounds, the packer is liable to a fine ; but he is not compelled to stamp the weight.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—This Bill provides that the Governor-in-Council may declare certain sized packages to be the standard sizes, and if the Order-in-Council goes on to say that the standard size shall be 1, 2, or 3 pounds and so on, it provides for weight.

HON. MR. TURNER—The Order-in-Council makes it emphatic that the size shall be so and so, but this Bill does not provide for a specific weight ; but if the party takes upon himself to stamp his packages as containing a specific weight he is liable to a fine if they do not contain that weight.

HON. MR. WARK—Most of the canned goods sold are composed, to a certain extent, of solid and liquid substances. Supposing that the solid and liquid, of which the goods are composed, contain a little more of the solid in one can than in another, the one containing the greater portion of solid matter is the heavier, and I do not see how you can adjust it, except by establishing a standard size for the package.

HON. MR. POWER—The Act of last year provided that the canned goods should have the weight marked on the packages, and also provided a penalty of two dollars for each tin, or can, or package, that was not so marked. Then it was provided that it should only come into force on the 1st of January, 1885. I understand, however, that the Department found that this section was unworkable, and they never put it into operation. It was suspended by Order-in-Council, consequently that ounce of experience is worth a great deal of theory. I think the Minister has suggested as to the point that I raised about the variation of half an ounce, that it might be made not exceeding

the rate of one-half ounce in each pound. I think the better way would be to say "provided always, that a variation of three per cent. shall not be deemed a violation of the provisions of this section," because it relates to weight and size as well.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have no objection to that amendment.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that that should be made five per cent.; three per cent. is too small.

HON. MR. POWER—I should like to know what the hon. member from Hamilton (Mr. Turner) thinks of that?

HON. MR. SMITH—You cannot bind people to an exact thing in canned liquids.

HON. MR. TURNER—I think three per cent. is quite enough.

HON. MR. SMITH—I want to save those who have cans already made.

HON. MR. POWER—These canned goods are sold in very large quantities. A packer puts up perhaps a thousand packages and sells them to one individual at such a weight or quantity. Five per cent. on that is a considerable quantity—fifty packages.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It is very little to each purchaser.

HON. MR. POWER—Under the proposed amendment there might be the weight of fifty packages in a thousand short. That is going a little too far. Better leave it as the Department fixed it. Three per cent. is what the other House sent up, and what the Department fixed.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It seems to be the opinion of the House that it should be three per cent.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Why should not the date at which the article was packed be put on the can? The public can tell the weight, but they have no means of knowing how long the contents have been packed.

HON. MR. SMITH—The hon. gentleman does not understand the difficulty of putting the date on each can in that way.

The clause was adopted.

On the sixth clause,

HON. MR. KAULBACH said: I think the Minister of Justice will see the necessity of requiring packers to put the date of packing on each can. You can tell the capacity and weight of a can, but not how long it has been kept in stock.

HON. MR. TURNER—The Department have gained some experience since the passing of the last Act. They found that they had got themselves into an awkward position in working it out. This year they have adopted the more cautious policy of feeling their way. A great many of these changes are improvements, and by-and-bye, when everything is in good working order, other improvements can be effected. If you want to have this Act working properly, let it pass as it is now, and we can afterwards deal with other improvements.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It will give grocers a chance to work off stale goods.

HON. MR. DEVER—Above all things, I believe the date of packing should be marked on the package. What merchant to-day would like to buy a hundred barrels of fish without knowing the date of packing?

HON. MR. SMITH—This Bill does not deal with fish in barrels.

HON. MR. DEVER—Everyone knows that if the date of packing the fish were not marked on the barrel, the greatest imposition would be practised.

HON. MR. TURNER—If herrings were packed in sealed cans the date would make no difference.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Crosse & Blackwell, and other well-known firms do not put the date of packing on their cans.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—The next clause permits the packer to put the date of packing on his cans. It is not compulsory.

The clause was adopted.

HON. MR. GIRARD, from the Committee, reported the Bill with amendments, which were concurred in.

The Senate adjourned at 4.25 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Friday, May 22nd, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

PETITIONS.

HON. MR. SMITH presented a number of petitions, praying that ale, porter, lager beer, light wines and cider be exempted from the operation of the Canada Temperance Act, and that the said Act may not come into force unless supported by a three-fifths majority of those voting. He said: I can only say, in support of those petitions, that they were not thought of until last Saturday morning, and it shows you the feeling of the country on this subject. I know a large number of the gentlemen who have signed those petitions in the several counties and cities from which they come, and I can say that more respectable petitioners have never presented a prayer to this hon. House. Take them all in all, they are the true temperance men of our country. They are men of wealth and standing, men who have the welfare of our country at heart, and I earnestly hope that the House will give their petitions that consideration to which the standing and number of the petitioners entitle them. The petitions presented here to-day are signed by 35,526 electors in the province of Ontario. In a great many cases where the petitions come from cities, the residence and number of the street are given with each signature, and there is, therefore, nothing fictitious about them.

THE NORTH-WEST REBELLION.

INQUIRY.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER rose to call the attention of the Government to the destitute condition of the wives and families of certain volunteers, who have been killed or wounded in suppressing the outbreak in our North-West, and ask the Government whether it is their purpose to grant immediate aid in those cases, where such families are in a state of destitution? He said: The question which I now submit to the House, is one which, in my judgement, calls for our most earnest consideration. The dread calamity of *open insurrection* has been brought upon the country, which has led to much loss of life and to the maiming and wounding of many of our young patriotic and noble volunteers.

The whole united press and people of the country are deeply sensible of the manly and *self-sacrificing* spirit manifested by one and all of the force ordered to proceed to the disaffected districts. The manner in which they have faced every difficulty—undergoing great bodily suffering and privations, without a single instance of murmuring—and the extraordinary valor which they have displayed in every conflict with the half-breeds and Indians—displaying, as General Middleton observed, the steadiness of the regulars of Her Majesty's service,—I say, when we calmly consider all this, we must admit that they merit the most profound gratitude of the country, and if, through rendering this noble service—leaving their houses and avocations and trades—many of their families have been brought to destitute circumstances—there cannot, surely, be two opinions, namely, that it is the duty of the state to aid and relieve in some measure such afflicted families. Such affliction has not arisen from any improvidence on their part, but from their praiseworthy desire to serve their country. They have gone forth as a most exemplary and industrious class of our young men upon a national public emergency to restore law and order, where life and property were being daily sacrificed.

Those men have risked the loss of their regular employment and their lives, receiving little compensation for the services they have rendered, and when we consider that many of them are the fathers of families who have been depending upon them for their food and clothing, while others are in the position of sons supporting a parent or other members of the family; I say, when we consider this, I think we must all agree that in such cases where the men have been killed or wounded, or disabled upon that important service, their families should not be left to depend entirely upon private charity and bounty.

I say, without hesitation, that we should recognize the just claims of such families thus deprived of their protectors, and of their means of support, as claims upon the state, and as claims richly deserving to be recognized.

Special pleadings may be advanced:

1st.—That the men volunteered to go on their own risk, and their families must run the risk—and many other pleadings may be made.

But I believe I express correctly the feeling which generally animated our citizen soldiers to go to the front so cheerfully and without a murmur, when I say that it was a feeling of duty and a high sense of honor. They exclaimed:

"We entered the volunteer service in times of peace, and it shall not be said that we now shrink from the hardships, and privations, and toil of long marches, or from even facing the ambush mode of warfare adopted by the Indian tribes."

Why, about a week ago the Queen's Government cabled to us an announcement that £100 stg. shall be given to the widows of Canadian boatmen who perished on the Nile, and half that amount to families who lost a son. Let it not be said, that as a Parliament or a Government, we are insensible to the common claims of humanity—which, in this case, are so clear and conclusive. Let it not be said that the action of this Parliament is to appropriate moneys for the most contemptible party purposes—to enable one party to defeat the other—but that we have no moneys to relieve in any degree the families of those men who have been maimed and wounded and shed their blood to suppress an alarming insurrection.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The subject that the hon. senator from Woodstock has brought to the notice of the House is one of great interest. We all deeply feel that there is a great debt of gratitude due by the people of this country to the volunteers who have so nobly performed the task of subduing the rebellion in the North-West. They have, as the hon. gentleman has observed, encountered very great privations and hardships. Many of them were not inured to that style of life. It was perfectly novel to them, and for the people of Canada they have risked their lives. Many valuable lives have already been taken in the short period since the rebellion has broken out, and I am quite sure that the people of Canada will feel that it is a proper thing that no man who has risked his life in the defence of the Dominion should suffer either in his own person or in that of his family. Many public institutions from which young men were drafted, had with a spirit of patriotism and propriety, directed that their pay should go on, although the volunteer was absent on service; but there are many, no doubt, who have not the kindly care that some employers have manifested towards the volunteers. The condition of those, if it is as at all represented by the hon. senator from Woodstock, (and I fear there are such cases) should at once meet with the attention of the Government. I am quite sure, whether their attention is drawn to it by direct appeal or not, it should be at once anticipated and every care taken that any of the families of volunteers who have left them dependent in any way, either upon municipal charity or on the kindness of friends, should be seen to; that no family should in any way suffer by the absence of the bread-winner. We can all feel alike on the subject. We all feel that too much cannot be said or too much done on behalf of those who have risked their lives in order that this rebellion might be put down, and I hope, therefore, to hear that the Government duly appreciate the importance of this subject, and that they will recognize those services with no niggardly hand. The pay of a volunteer we know is a bagatelle. It is preposterous to talk of a family being supported on it. Many of the men now fighting our battles in the North-West have had to make large sacrifices. Those sacrifices

ought not to fall on them, but on the people of Canada, by whom it will not be regarded as a burden, but as a debt of gratitude that will be gladly paid. The families of any men who are lost in that country should receive attention, not on the old basis, not rated on the basis that the pension is paid on in the regular army, but on a basis which will show that the people of Canada duly recognize their patriotic service. Most ample remuneration should be left to the families, that the pecuniary loss of the head of the house shall not be felt. The keen anguish of mind will have to be endured, but so far as sympathy and consideration for support hereafter are concerned, I am quite confident that the whole of the people of Canada are in accord on that subject, and it ought not to require any proposition on the part of Parliament, although it is the correct avenue through which opinion should be expressed, to assure the Government that they cannot overstep the line in that direction. Our acts should be generous rather than fair, and I trust here that the Minister of Justice, when he discloses what the policy of the Government will be, will inform the House that it will be such as will assure the people of Canada that they have not been unmindful of, or ungrateful to, the volunteers who have so nobly gone to the front on short notice.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman from Ottawa will, of course, perceive that it requires time to get the necessary information together, in order to deal with those cases. No specific cases have come yet under the notice of the Governmeut. We only know generally, as all the world knows, and as the newspapers assert, that there are cases such as the hon. gentleman describes. The Government are quite sensible of the obligation which the country owes to the volunteers who have been fighting their battles in the North-West, and will not be found wanting in their duty in regard to them. But until all the information which is necessary to deal with the cases of those who have suffered has been got together, it will be impossible for us to take any step. It will be necessary that we should deal with all of them, and in order to get this information some time will be required. In the meantime, I can only express my concurrence in very much of what has fallen from my hon. friend and assure him that the matter is under the consideration of the Government, and that they duly appreciate their position with regard to these unfortunate sufferers.

HON. MR. ALMON—Have the Government received any information to-day from the North-West?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I understand that the telegram announcing that Poundmaker had asked on what terms he could surrender, is true. I do not know whether the Minister of Militia has received any specific information himself on the subject, but he tells me that he has no doubt the information published to-day is true.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—Has any news been received concerning Mrs. Delaney?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not know that the Government have received any tidings about her.

HON. MR. DEVER—It is reported about town to-day that she is safe.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (118), "An Act further to amend the Acts relating to Weights and Measures." He said: The first clause of this Bill repeals the section of the Weights and Measures Act which provided that 25 gallons should mean a barrel, and substitutes in lieu of it "two gallons shall be a peck, and eight gallons shall be a bushel." It also provides certain weights for various products, and what a barrel of apples shall mean. The reasons why some of these alterations are made I will give in committee. There is one with reference to bituminous coal. It would seem that where coal is retailed it is frequently sold by measure, to the injury of those who buy. The effect of the Bill in that respect would be

to compel persons to sell coal by weight ; it will be much safer for those persons who buy coal in small quantities. The barrel adopted as the standard for apples, is a flour barrel.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I think that the plan adopted by the draughtsman in preparing this Bill is calculated to mislead. The only effect of the second clause is to add "bituminous coal 70 lbs.," to the existing law. The attempt to enforce the sale of goods by weight, instead of by measure, is of questionable wisdom. I see it is open for parties by special agreement to sell by measure. I know that in the city of Halifax, the law provided that coal should be sold by weight in large quantities, and I think the same provision exists as to potatoes and turnips and things of that sort, but it has been found so inconvenient that the law is almost uniformly disregarded, and such products are sold by measure. I think that the better way would be to leave the parties to decide for themselves whether the goods should be sold by measure or by weight, provided, of course, if these goods are sold by weight they shall be at the weight specified in the second clause of this Bill. I think it would be better to modify the second clause so as to leave it optional with the parties to sell either by weight or by measure, simply providing that if they do sell by measure, the weight of a bushel shall be as set out in the clause.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—I rather disagree with my hon. friend about coal. I do not know what the practice is at Halifax, but I know in the city of St. John hard coal is universally sold by weight.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is safer.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—All respectable wholesale dealers in coal provide themselves with a large platform scale and the weight of each cart is known, and the coal is weighed in that way. It is a municipal law; whether it will be satisfactory or not that the Dominion Government should take possession of the weighing scales, I cannot say. Soft coal is more universally used in Nova Scotia. I do not think soft coal could be as safely weighed as it could be measured ; so, to meet the requirements of the trade in both soft and hard coal, it would be well to have the two means of weighing and measuring ; that is, weighing for the hard coal, and measuring, perhaps, for the other. Soft coal is liable to absorb wet, and it would not always be fair to sell it by weight, but hard coal is a different commodity. I think the fairest way to both parties would be to have it weighed and see that proper scales are provided for the purpose.

Hon. Mr. WARK—Have the Government ascertained how far this will interfere with the shipment of apples? I believe it is now the rule in Canada to use barrels of the size indicated in this Bill ; but in the United States the barrel holds only two bushels. We ship very large quantities of apples now from the Annapolis valley to England to compete with the American apples, and it might be very awkward to have to make our barrels larger than the American barrels. It would be well to inquire how this would affect the export of apples from Nova Scotia.

Hon. Mr McINNES (B.C.)—I hope when this Bill is referred to a committee of the whole House, that the Minister of Justice will accept of a suggestion, to do away with bushels and pecks, when applied to solids, altogether. I think it is high time that we should drop the old and rather tedious way of disposing of solids by the bushel. I speak after some years experience on the Pacific coast, and I say that the system of selling by weight prevails there from Mexico to Alaska. If you buy anything solid, whether it is potatoes, hay, grain or anything solid, it bought by weight, whether it is 10, 20 or 100 lbs. or a ton or 100 tons, and I think it is by all odds the fairest way of buying or selling. You know what you are buying then. So far as fluids are concerned, that is an entirely different matter. I cannot agree with the hon. member from Halifax with respect to dispcsing of coal by measurement. It would be only a short time, if bushels were done away with, until they would fall into it, and it would be a great deal more acceptable and convenient than the present system. It is within my own recollection when we

had the Halifax currency and figured up the price of everything in pounds, shillings, pence and farthings. We all know how readily we got into the decimal currency, and I believe as great an improvement could be effected in the present system if the bushel were expunged in the case of solids. I merely throw out the suggestion, so that when the Bill is referred to a committee of the whole, the matter can be considered.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN—While I agree with the hon. gentleman from British Columbia, there would be some hardship, I think, in adopting selling by weight in the Maritime Provinces, unless it is made optional. A vessel might go for a cargo of potatoes to some place in Prince Edward Island, where there is no means of weighing, and it would be better under such circumstances to leave it optional to sell either by weight or by measure. This Bill provides what a bushel shall be. While I am strongly in favor of the decimal system and of weighing all solids, still until we get further advanced in that direction this is a good Bill, because it leaves it optional with the purchaser and vendor to make their arrangements either to weigh or measure. I think the hon. member's suggested amendment would cause a great deal of inconvenience to vessels taking cargoes of turnips, potatoes and oats from small ports in the Maritime Provinces where they would have no means of weighing them. It is difficult to weigh roots except on a large scale, where they can be weighed by the cartload. With regard to the apple question, the hon. gentleman from Fredericton is misinformed as to the American system of putting up apples. This Bill is to conform to the American system. The barrel provided for here is the flour barrel. Section 3 is as follows:—

"All apples packed in Canada for sale shall be packed in good and strong barrels of seasoned hardwood or basswood made as nearly cylindrical as may be; the staves of such barrels shall be 27 inches in length from croe to croe, with heads from 16 and one-half to 17 inches in diameter; and such barrels shall be sufficiently hooped, with a lining hoop within the chimes, the whole well secured by nails."

That is the exact size of a flour barrel, and it is to conform to that that this Bill is proposed, because I know last year, myself, a large quantity of apples came from Nova Scotia to Charlottetown, and at an auction sale there was as great a variety of barrels as there were coopers who made the barrels. There was a difference of from one-fourth of an inch to one inch in the length of the staves. This Bill provides for a uniform size, and in the United States apples are packed in barrels of this size. Each barrel holds two bushels and three pecks.

Hon. Mr. POWER—My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Dever) was mistaken in his criticism of what I said, because this Bill refers only to soft coal and consequently the hon. member agrees with me. I think our countrymen on the Pacific slope are a little further advanced than we are on the Atlantic coast, but if our people are benighted enough to prefer to remain in their present condition for a little while longer, I do not see why our advanced friends should not allow them to do so. The hon. member from Alberton has given a very good reason why the sale of roots by weight should not be made compulsory, and I had in my mind, when I spoke, the case of a Halifax merchant visiting the province of Prince Edward Island to purchase a cargo of roots, and that is why I said that the purchaser, as well as the seller, would prefer that the sale should be by measure rather than by weight, and the vessels which bring coal from Cape Breton are in somewhat the same position. If it suits the buyer and seller to have goods sold by measure rather than by weight, I do not see why they should not be allowed to do as they please about it. My suggestion was that the necessity for a special agreement should be done away with. The Bill says that a bushel shall be determined by weighing, unless the bushel by measure is specially agreed upon. If a man buys a bushel of anything he understands that it is measured. If he wants to buy so many pounds of an article then of course it is weighed, and I think the better way would be simply not to require a special agreement where the article is bought by the bushel.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B. C.)—In reply to the arguments advanced by the

hon. members from Alberton and Halifax, with regard to the difficulties which might arise from not having scales to weigh those articles, it might be made compulsory on vessel owners to have scales on board their vessels—that is, those that deal in produce or coal. It would not cost a great deal. As far as bituminous coal is concerned, that is the quality we have in British Columbia, and they never think of buying it there by measurement; it is all by weight.

HON. MR. POWER—We do not want to interfere with you.

HON. MR. McINNES—I venture to say if you put that once on the statute book the majority of the people living down there by the sea will prefer it to the system of measurement.

HON. MR. READ—It will be in the recollection of many of us that an attempt was made a few years ago to introduce the decimal system of measurement on this continent, and it has been, in certain places, established. To-day all grains are sold by the 100 lbs. in Detroit. In Liverpool, England, all grain is sold by the 100 lbs. and the sooner we can come to that system, also, the better. They speak of the inconvenience of selling potatoes or coal or turnips by weight, but it is certainly as convenient to weigh them as to measure them. I say it is more convenient to weigh them, and it is decidedly safer and more just, and I look forward to see that system adopted entirely, and that this antiquated system that 34 lbs. shall be a bushel and 60 lbs. shall be a bushel, and so on will be altogether done away with.

HON. MR. ALMON—I would like to ask how oysters are to be sold? I sometimes buy a bushel of shell oysters, and I would not like to be told that I was buying them illegally in that way.

HON. MR. FLINT—The hon. gentleman, being a surgeon, ought to know how to separate the oyster from the shell, and then he could measure his oysters.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I think it is very just when applied to wholesale transactions, but this Bill is evidently intended to be in the interest of poorer purchasers. Poor people want sometimes to buy a half a bushel of oats for instance, and, however it might answer the purposes of those who deal wholesale, sale by weight does not so answer the purposes of the poor man. It is the same with coal. A poor man goes into a coal store and buys perhaps enough for a week's consumption, and for the convenience of those poorer purchasers, we must have some such system as is here proposed. I am quite in favor of the adoption of the cental system in dealing with the rest of the world, but we must retain on the statute book a measure of this kind in the interest of the poorer classes.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The 17th section of the Act of 1879, provides for precisely the same articles being sold by weight.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The clause has been repealed and re-enacted in this Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (V), "An Act respecting the Administration of Justice, and other matters in the North-West Territories."

He said: This Bill proposes to make certain changes in the law of the North-West, which changes are not very important except as regards the final one, which is to prohibit the sale of arms. The earlier changes are to remove some defects which have developed themselves from time to time in the law as it now stands with respect to the North-West Territories. The first one is to remove the restrictions as to penalties which are imposed respecting certain offences. The original Act restricted it to $100. The Stipendary Magistrates there thought it doubtful whether this penalty did not interfere with the power to impose imprisonment as well as a fine, and it was thought better

to repeal the fine altogether, and allow the magistrates to impose any fine they please. The next one is to provide more certainly for taxation there. Some doubt has arisen respecting the power of the Council to impose a tax for school purposes, and we want to remove any doubt with regard to that. The next is with regard to the electoral districts. It seems as the law stands that where an electoral district is once constituted that it becomes crystalized and cannot afterwards be changed. After the population increases they may want to change a district and there is no reason why they should not have the right to change the electoral districts from time to time. The next clause is held back for the House of Commons, it is with respect to the appointment of Stipendary Magistrates. The next clause is to provide for a man being tried, if he pleases, by the Stipendiary Magistrate without the intervention of a jury. With regard to the sale of arms we think it better, considering the disturbed state of that part of the Dominion, that the sale of arms of precision should be restricted for a time at all events, and we have adopted the same language that we adopted here some years ago when we thought it desirable to impose some such restriction with regard to the sale of arms. A district may be proclaimed, and within that district so long as the law remains in force, the sale of arms of precision shall be restricted. The exception is smooth-bore arms, muzzle-loading arms, inasmuch as smooth-bore breach loaders are liable to be used with an inside rifle barrel, by which they are enabled to be converted into rifle-shooting arms. The power will be exercised by the Governor-in-Council, and the proclamation may be revoked by Order-in-Council. I think the House will agree that under the circumstances now prevailing in the North-West some such restriction is necessary. When first the news came down from the North-West it was generally believed that the half-breeds and Indians were well armed with rifles, and that we were going to encounter a foe that were well armed. Happily it has turned out that they were only partially provided with arms of precision. After a district has been proclaimed under this Act, anybody that sells arms to an Indian will be liable to a penalty. I think the House will agree with me that the sale of such arms should be restrained and that this will be a safe provision in the interests of the country.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I entirely approve of the proposition of the Government to prohibit the introduction of what is called the rifle, and superior small arms into the North-West. Some years ago when I had to do with the administration of that country through the Mounted Police, I was very much impressed with the danger that was likely to arise from the introduction of superior arms into that country. It was brought to my notice, as far back as 1876 or 77, the number of superior arms that were being brought into the North-West by the traders, and without legislation I endeavored to stop it in a moderate way. I remember at the time being deeply impressed with the probable dangers that might arise with the distribution of improved fire-arms amongst the nomadic population of that country; therefore, I think it is not too soon to adopt a positive enactment that what are known as the Winchester and Snider, and superior arms, apart from the smooth bore, should be prohibited. In addition to that, I think that in future settlements that will have to be made with the Indians, more particularly those who have taken up arms in rebellion, that one of the conditions on which peace should be made with the savages is the surrender of all rifles in their possession. The shot gun, of course, must be permitted. They will largely depend upon the game that they kill for their living and the shot gun should be left to them. But I think, outside of what is known as the ordinary shot gun, all the superior arms should be taken away and only permitted, in that country, to volunteers that will, no doubt, now meet and form companies in the various centres, where population has gravitated. Outside of that I think the rifle ought not to be permitted to be sold. My hon. friend proposes to exclude also the breach loader. I do not know that that is material, because I do not see any special difference as far as the bullets are concerned, between the breach loader and the muzzle loader. We all remember the old Brown Bess as a muzzle loader, and the execution that was done with it. Shot guns will carry bullets whether you put

them in at the muzzle or at the breach, but they will not carry such a long distance.

HON. MR. MACDONALD — What will become of the stock of rifles in the hands of traders? It may be a very great loss to many of them who would be deterred from selling.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I should not think there would be any very large stocks of rifles in the hands of traders out there. However, I will consider that point.

HON. MR. DEVER—I do not wish to interfere, in any way, in anything that would be the means of making that country safer than it is for persons who reside in it, but I would say to the Minister of Justice that the breech loader is the gun of the day as a fowling piece. In fact, the muzzle loader is completely obsolete. Nobody will have it who can get a breech-loader, and I do not know that the breech loader is any more dangerous than the muzzle loader. I have both at home, and I know if I were to use a smooth bore for bullets, I would use the muzzle loader and not the breech loader.

HON. MR. POWER—I think we had better leave the Bill as it is. I do not think there will be, for some time, any danger there from muzzle loaders, or breech loaders either. I think General Middleton, with his shrapnel shell and gatling guns, has put an end to any danger of trouble in the immediate future. The provision is a very wise one as it stands in the Bill. I think that restricting the people out there not to kill game, except with muzzle loaders, would drobably be very inconvenient.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

THE ADULTERATION ACT.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (W), "An Act respecting the adulteration of food, drugs, and agricultural fertilizers." He said: This is a Bill prepared in the Department of Inland Revenue for the purpose of preventing the adulteration of agricultural fertilizers, and also to make some alterations with respect to the adulteration of food and drugs. The changes, I think, down to sub-section 1 of G, on the second page, are not very important. That one requires that the component parts of any mixture sold as a fertilizer are to be mentioned on the label in conspicuous characters forming an inseparable part of the general label, which shall also bear the name and address of the manufacturer. Then there is a clause adding:—

(*h.*) Every agricultural fertilizer shall be deemed to be "adulterated" within the meaning of this Act, if, when sold, offered or exposed for sale, the chemical analysis thereof shows a deficiency of more than one per cent. of any of the chemical substances, the percentages whereof are required to be specified in the certificate by "*The Fertilizers Act*, 1885," required to be affixed to each barrel, box, sack or package containing the same, or, if the agricultural fertilizer is in bulk, to be produced to the inspector; or if it contains less than the minimum per centage of such substances required by the said Act to be contained in such fertilizer.

Clauses 20 and 21 are entirely new. They provide for the detention of the article until the sample is analyzed and also for the confiscation of adulterated articles. Clause 25 is also new and provides a penalty for attaching a false label. The other changes in the Act, I will explain to the Committee when the Bill is being considered clause by clause.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I thought that we had dealt satisfactorily last session with the subject of agricultural fertilizers, and I was therefore rather surprised to see the subject alluded to again in the Bill before us. It strikes me that the percentage mentioned here is rather large. It seems to be supposed that an agricultural fertilizer contains a certain percentage of some specific article and that the whole of the rest is of a uniform value; but the actual soluble contents of 100 lbs. weight of an agricultural fertilizer is a comparatively small proportion—and one per cent. deficiency in that, seems to be a rather large proportion. I am not sufficiently conversant with the subject myself to be able to offer a decided opinion, but on looking over

the Bill is struck me that 1 per cent. was a large percentage of the more valuable proportion of the fertilizer, the percentage of which is specified on the label; I therefore took the opportunity of communicating with a competent person on this subject, and I have not had time yet to receive a reply; but perhaps if the Bill is not hurried through, if nobody in the House at present is able to enlighten us on that point, it will be settled in another way.

HON. MR. WARK—It will depend upon what construction is put upon the term "1 per cent." If it is 1 per cent. of the whole 100 lbs., or 1 per cent. of the ingredient which is supposed to give value to the mixture, that ought to be carefully defined.

HON. MR. POWER—I am very glad to see a measure of this kind introduced. The adulteration of food, and drugs and agricultural fertilizers, is just one of those things which, in the interest of the public, the Government should deal with, and I am very glad to see that the Department of Inland Revenue has taken hold of this matter, and when we come to examine the Bill in detail I trust it will be found as good as we expect it to be. I shall now call the attention of the Minister to one expression in this Bill which I do not understand. In sub-section D of section 2 there is a reference made to the Fertilizers Act of 1885. As far as I know, no such Bill has been passed this session. There may have been, but if there is I am not aware of it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This is the Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—This Bill is cited as the Adulteration Act. I have been looking at the Act of last year, respecting agricultural fertilizers, and it does not refer to any officer who is authorized to procure those samples and it has no short title, and it occurs to me that possibly there is some error there.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There may be some error there; I will inquire.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

FORT McLEOD RANCHE TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

SECOND READING.

HON. MR. GIRARD moved the second reading of Bill (80), "An Act to incorporate the Fort McLeod Ranche Telegraph Company." He said: The object of this Bill is to incorporate a company to establish telegraphic communication between Calgary and Fort McLeod. As it is very desirable that that part of the country should have as much telegraphic communication as possible, I am sure there will be no disposition on the part of this House to oppose the second reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

AN ADJOURNMENT.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I ought to have moved yesterday that when the House adjourns to-day it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, over the Queen's Birthday. I now move, with the permission of the House, the suspension of the 14th rule, which is the one requiring an intermediate day's notice, in order to enable me to move that when the House adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until Tuesday next

HON. MR. POWER—I do not object to the Minister's motion, but I do not think the two motions should be coupled together. I think the first motion should be to suspend the rule and then when that motion is carried the motion for adjournment should be moved.

THE SPEAKER—The usual course in this House has been to couple the two motions together.

HON. MR. POWER—That may be, but I do not think it is regular, because any single member, by objecting to the motion on the ground of want of notice, may stop it altogether, whereas once the suspension of the rule is agreed to the majority of the House can carry the adjournment.

THE SPEAKER—The motion as put to the House is, I think, the usual one, and quite regular.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 4.35 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Tuesday, May 26th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, AND LIQUOR LICENSE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The Order of the Day having been called for the third reading of Bill 92, "The Canada Temperance Act 1878, and the Liquor License Act 1883, further amendment Bill" as amended;

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: I hardly remember how this Bill got into my name, as I had not charge of it; it is Mr. Vidal's Bill, but I will move the third reading, *pro forma*, seconded by Mr. Vidal.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I decline to second it.

HON. MR. FLINT—It will be recollected that on the withdrawal of the motion to throw out the Bill, it was stated that if we would allow the Bill to go into committee any one who wished to address the House on the subject would have an opportunity to do so on the third reading. I intended to have spoken on that occasion, but as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice rose at the same time that I did, I took my seat for the purpose of knowing what he intended to say, and on finding what he intended to do, I informed the House that I would speak on the subject, and the hon. gentleman very courteously told me I would have an opportunity to speak on the third reading of the Bill. I therefore desire to enter at some length into the question because a great many others have done so, and in approaching it I intend to do so as calmly and as considerately as I can. It is not necessary to mention my principles here; they are well known in this House. But I think I have a right to give my views on this question, and I shall endeavor to do so in as frank a manner as I possibly can in touching on such subjects, as I think most proper for me to do as a supporter of the great cause of total abstinence. It may be recollected that when my hon. friend from Sarnia first rose to address the House, he mentioned the number of places where the Act had passed and the majorities in its favor, and he contended from that, that if the majorities were of that nature he could claim for the Act that wherever it had been adopted it was by a fair majority. The hon. gentleman from Niagara took issue with him on that question and stated, if I mistake not, that where the majority did not amount to more than half the total vote, those that did not vote might be considered to be opposed to the Scott Act. The hon. gentleman from Amherst also took that ground, but I think both gentlemen are mistaken and I shall give my reasons why I think they were mistaken. The great question of the re-passing of the Act in the county of Halton was one which was taken up very strongly on both sides of the question, and at that time it was currently reported, and I believe correctly reported, too, that $10,000 had been raised for the purpose of endeavoring to defeat the Act in the county of Halton. Some persons stated that they had subscribed largely towards it and mentioned it as a matter of fact that persons were employed to lecture against the Scott Act, and they were well paid, but unfortunately for those who spent their money in that way their efforts were a failure, and the Act was sustained by a much larger majority than on the first occasion.

Now, I hold that if with that money the Anti-Scott men could not bring sufficient support to vote down the Act, it certainly showed that those who did not vote at all were as much, or even more, in favor of the Act than they were opposed to it. This is a principle which I think may be

laid down as perfectly sound—that those who were opposed to the measure, with the large amount of means that they had at their command, used all the influence that they possibly could exercise, and they certainly failed to defeat the Act there; they having failed to do so, I have a right to assume that those who remained at home did so from a belief that there would be a majority in favor of the Act, and that they were as much supporters of the Act as if they had voted for it. What took place there has occurred in other constituencies, and consequently I must differ from the hon. member from Niagara and others who have used the same argument, and I have a right to claim for our side those who did not go to the polls; if they had not been in favor of the Act they certainly should have made some effort to prevent its being carried.

The hon. member from Niagara mentioned, though I did not notice it just at the time, that the 145th clause of the Act was being dealt with in the House in reference to what is called the McCarthy Act, which embraced all that was necessary on that subject, and, therefore, that that amendment was not necessary as far as regarded the Bill before the House; but unfortunately it happens that that is not so. I do not accuse the hon. gentleman of wishing to misstate the case, but he certainly was incorrect, because I find on page 472 of the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons that a resolution was passed in the following words:—

Resolved, That in the opinion of this House such portions of the Liquor License Act of 1883, and the Act to amend the Liquor License Act of 1883, as the Supreme Court of Canada has declared to be *ultra vires*, should be suspended unless and until the same shall be decided by the Judical Committee of the Privy Council to be *intra vires* of the Parliament of Canada.

Now, that certainly excludes the 145th clause which is contained in the amendment now before us, and consequently my hon. friend is mistaken on that subject. I believe he would not intentionally misstate the case, and I wish to correct the error now.

The junior member from Halifax presented a petition to this House which at his request was read at length at the table. I feel that it is necessary for me, in discussing this matter, to make mention of that petition, and to read some portions of it, in order to present the views which I entertain. The second paragraph is as follows:

Your memorialists are informed that so far from the expectations entertained by the advocates of the Act, of beneficial effects of a moral nature having been realized, the quantities of ardent spirits sent into counties where the Act is in force, and consumed therein, have been greatly increased, but your memorialists are not themselves in possession of sufficient official information to enable them to vouch for the correctness of this statement.

Now, here were the liquor dealers themselves, petitioning in reference to this Act, and dealing in the article, as they must have been, or they certainly would not have signed this petition, they must have known whether there was an increase in the sale or not; but they were very cautious, far more so than some hon. gentlemen in this House, in making the statement that there was more liquor sold and used in those localities than before. They took the precaution to say that they could not make a statement in reference to that matter. So far as that goes, it shows, at least, that the liquor dealers themselves ought to have the best opportunity of knowing whether a greater or less quantity of liquor was consumed in those places after the adoption of the Act than before, because those who sold it must have known most about it. There could not have been a much larger quantity consumed in those places than formerly, because, as a matter of fact, there was not as much liquor manufactured in Canada in 1884 as there was in 1883, by some 25 per cent.

HON. MR. DEVER—Was there no more imported?

HON. MR. FLINT—I wish the hon. gentleman to understand this: that I do not interrupt anybody, and I do not like to be interrupted myself.

HON. MR. DEVER—It is as well to have the thing fairly stated to the House.

HON. MR. FLINT—At all events there was far less beer and far less liquor manufactured in the country in 1884 than there was in 1883.

HON. MR. DEVER—But there was more imported.

HON. MR. FLINT—That being the case, certainly it must have come from somewhere, and if it was imported it can easily be shown. If it was smuggled it would be difficult to ascertain; but if there was such a large quantity over and above what was manufactured in the country used, and particularly in those localities where it is alleged to have been used, then it must have come from somewhere. I repeat we have reason to believe that the liquor sellers themselves who signed that petition would know as much or more about it than gentlemen who did not sell the article. Now, these petitioners ask us to have a commission appointed to examine into this matter. It is very singular, indeed, that after this Act has been on our statute books for eight years they find out when it is being carried in another part of the country that it is necessary to have a commission appointed to examine and ascertain whether their allegations are true. It seems to me it should have been taken in hand long ago by those who think that the Act has been a failure. How are we to examine the question? Will liquor dealers act fairly or will they not return more liquor as sold than really has been sold? We have got to depend upon their own honesty, and I am afraid, from my knowledge of some liquor dealers, that very little honesty will be found in some of them. Now they want this important commission and they ask that the Act be suspended. Here is an Act which has been on the statute book for eight years. Up to the present time over 60 counties and cities have adopted it, and most of them are endeavoring to work it to the present day, and notwithstanding that these petitioners want to come down now and have the Act suspended.

They want to have the Act suspended pending this great inquiry that is to be made by this proposed commission, and then they want to turn us back again, and they want the whole thing to be done over in order to accommodate those gentlemen, or they will not be satisfied. Why should that be the case? Why should the Act be passed in so many counties and cities, and then its operation be suspended by Act of Parliament, in order that its opponents may have a chance to try and break it down again? I do not think they could do so, but nevertheless, it would place the supporters of the Act in a very wrong position. The districts that have adopted the Act, have done so with their eyes open, and they have a right to protection for that Act, and there is no reason why their right should be taken away from them in the manner suggested by the opponents of the Act. Some hon. gentlemen have said a great deal about the value of property and so on, and the effect that the adoption of this Act would have on the banks holding promissory notes and other commercial paper of men in the liquor trade. I ask what better positions should these men hold in relation to the banks, than men in any other branch of trade? I, as a lumberman, another gentleman as a merchant, and another as a manufacturer, are we not subject to the same difficulties and the same vicissitudes of trade that the liquor dealers are? And when the banks advance money on their paper, they have to run the same risk on it as they have to run with the paper of the liquor dealer. Those who are engaged in other branches of business have just as good a right to protection from Parliament in relation to the banks as the liquor dealers have. It is absurd, however, for the liquor dealers to say that the banks are going to stop advancing them money where the Act is carried, or that it is going to ruin them. I do not believe it will. I do not believe it will from the fact that I do not see any necessity for it. If a tavern keeper is deprived of his license under this Act he does not lose so much of the value of his property or his credit. Nothing but the bar room is taken out. The house is open, and the travelling community have the benefit of peace and quietness instead of, as in many instances now, being deprived of their ease and comfort by the noise and excitement in the bar rooms. I know, of my own experience, where it has been impossible for me to have an hour's rest at a hotel, in consequence of the rows corried on in the bar room. I do not see how the banks can suffer under this Act. Then, as to loan companies, all I have to say is, from my own knowledge of them, the more they lose

the better, and the quicker they break up the better for the country.

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—You have no stock there.

HON. MR. FLINT—I have no stock there, and I never intend to have. I have no stock except in my own self, and in my own pocket. A great deal has been said about vested rights ; now, hon. gentlemen, what are vested rights ? Is a grant, under an Act of Parliament, to certain persons to sell liquor for twelve months to make a vested right—that they have a right for all time to come—and if the licenses are not issued to them for all time to come, that they have a right to compensation ? I say not ; I say it cannot possibly be. I, as a lumberman, and others in the same business, obtain licenses in the same way for our limits, as the liquor dealers obtain their licenses for the sale of liquor. There is a law in reference to timber lands, under which the Government give a timber berth, and we pay our license fee, and at the end of the year we have to renew that license ; supposing the Government see fit to withdraw one, two, or twenty lots from the license, we have no right to go back to the Government and say that because we have built a mill, we have a claim for damages for lots being sold out of our limits. I have had some of the most valuable lots taken from my limits in that way and sold after I had been paying ten or fifteen years ground rent for them. Under all the circumstances the liquor dealers cannot claim on vested rights. In reference to vested rights allow me to read an extract from an English paper :—

COMPENSATION.

The way in which licenses are renewed clearly shows there is no such thing as vested rights.

This point has been discussed and practically settled in England.

"In the Orvil Darwin case, when 34 licenses were withdrawn without any assigned reason, Mr. Nash, an eminent lawyer, who was counsel for the liquor sellers, whose licenses had been withdrawn, said : I am sorry to say, having looked into this question most exhaustively, and compared notes with many of my brethern well versed in these matters, that there cannot be the smallest doubt that in the strictest sense no such thing as a vested interest exists, and that, subject to appeal, the magistrates can refuse to renew the license of the largest, most useful and best conducted hotel in England."

If those are not vested rights in England they are not here, and I cannot admit that a vested right can be given for anything which the Government might take away ; consequently, as far as that goes, I think vested rights are out of the question in relation to the liquor trade. If you come down to compensation, I do not believe in it generally, but notwithstanding that, I would be willing to vote a sum of money sufficient to give a fair compensation if we could only get rid of the liquor traffic. I say it, not because I believe I would be doing what I ought to do, but because I feel desirous to get rid of the liquor trade. When the great demonstration came down here from Toronto last winter, at the interview with Sir John Macdonald in the Opera House, it was there stated by the gentleman who represented their case that the country would save $30,000,000 a year by getting rid of the liquor traffic, and that the Government could afford to give $10,000,000 in compensation for the sake of getting rid of that traffic altogether. If the country would save $30,000,000 by taking that course it would not take long to make up $100,000,000 at that rate, and $10,000,000 would be a small matter if we could save $30,000,000 the first year. Taking them on their own ground, I contend that each year we could save double that amount in the expenses of the country. When we come to take into consideration the amount that is expended in liquor, the waste of grain, the amount expended in supporting our jails, penitentiaries, judges and juries, and all those things, and the losses by fire and water occasioned by drinking customs, I say it would be more than double that, and we could afford to lose the $5,700,000 revenue from the liquor traffic when we would save $30,0000,000 by abolishing it. I have not got these figures by me, and at present I have not the time to go into them ; but it is quite evident that we would be making money by getting rid of the liquor traffic, and it matters not if we had to suffer a little at first, we would surely make it up afterwards. One hon. gentleman from Toronto spoke of the loss

to the revenue being five or six millions of dollars per year; supposing it is six millions, how many souls are lost for that six millions of dollars? How many go to the drunkard's grave because of that $6,000,000? It is computed to be 6,000 souls every year—probably it may be more and it may be less; at all events it is a vast loss of human life for the sake of gaining $6,000,000 for the revenue, when every dollar must be represented by five or ten dollars that are lost. I hold, under the circumstances that we are not gaining anything by the amount of revenue which the Government derives from the liquor traffic. I am satisfied in my own mind that it is a losing concern, and any gentleman engaged in business, if he found that it took $10 expenditure to gain $1, would at once abandon that business and go at something else, and I think the sooner the Government abandon this source of revenue, and obtain their money in another way, the better for the country. The money expended in liquor means not only the loss of the money itself, but loss of time. Those who are in the habit of drinking continually lose their time, and time is money in a country like this, and for every dollar spent in liquor, we may consider that there is another dollar spent in loss of time. If this money were taken and used for other purposes, to purchase food, clothing and luxuries for families by those who spend it in liquor, the Government would soon make up the loss of revenue on liquors, from the duties which would come from that source; therefore, it would be no loss to the Government after a year or so, but a great gain. I think that on that principle if Parliament passed an Act abolishing the sale and manufacture, and importation of liquors altogether, it would be an actual saving to the country. These are the views that I entertain in reference to this subject, and I am perfectly satisfied that they are correct.

Now, with regard to the remarks of the junior member from Halifax (Mr. Almon) who brought in the amendment to the Bill which was carried by a large majority, exempting from the operation of the Act, ale, light wine, and cider containing not more than 12 per cent of alcohol, I would ask the hon. gentleman how is it to be known that the liquor sold under that provision will contain only 12 per cent of alcohol? Are we to appoint officers to inspect the liquor sold at every bar, and to see that there is nothing sold over the bar containing more than 12 per cent of alcohol? It cannot be done. It is only opening the door for carrying on the same system as now prevails, and it would be better, as a hotel keeper told me the other day, to strike out that amendment altogether and let the Bill stand as it is. You may depend upon one thing, and that is if this Bill as amended becomes law there will be a stick in almost every glass of beer, wine, or cider that is sold.

HON. MR. ALMON—Does the hon. gentleman intend me to answer the question how the strength of wines is to be ascertained.?

HON. MR. FLINT—That is the question.

HON. MR. ALMON—It is a very simple thing to do. Sikes' hydrometer shows the strength of different liquors. It cannot be had in every bar room, but all through the provinces there are persons in cities who analyze food and drugs under the Adulteration Act. All they have to do is to get rid of the saccharine matter in wine and the coloring matter, and then they can easily ascertain the strength. It cannot be analyzed in every bar-room, but the party who keeps the bar-room buys from some wholesale house. There is some particular brand on the liquor, and it is easily ascertained whether it is correct or not, or whether it is a brand of liquor that has already been tested and the strength ascertained. I do not think it is a very difficult matter at all.

HON. MR. FLINT—There is nothing in the hon. gentleman's amendment to compel any analysis of that kind. It is just left an open question. It is like laying down a set of bars for a flock of sheep—they may all run through it or stay in the field, as they choose. There is nothing to show that anything is to be done to find out whether there is more than 12 per cent. of alcohol in the liquors sold under this amendment.

HON. MR. ALMON—If the Bill is amended to provide the means to ascertain

that, will the hon. gentleman withdraw his opposition to my amendment?

HON. MR. FLINT—No, I will not. I am not going to tell you I will vote for that, because I know it would not be a fact. I shall now quote a few extracts bearing on the liquor question. I have taken a little pains during the past few days to look into it, and I have an analysis here of the different liquors. I am not going into the whole question because it is not necessary, but I will take an analysis of beer as given by Professor Draper :—

Alcohol - - - - - - -	4 o/o
Extract - - - - - - -	5.66
Acetic acid - - - - -	.17
Water - - - - - - -	90.17
	100.

HON. MR. ALMON—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. FLINT—The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." What I want to say is this; if they will take 22½ glasses of water and put a glass of whiskey into it, and a man drinks it, I do not think it will make him very drunk, because before he gets the whiskey into him he will have to drink so much water that he will burst. Then it must be borne in mind that this is not pure water, because, when you extract spirit from that beer, you cannot drink the water that is left.

HON. MR. PLUMB—You gentlemen would not drink it if you could.

HON. MR. FLINT—We do not want to drink it after the liquor is extracted. The analysis shows that in order to get a glass of alcohol a man must drink 22½ glasses of water.

HON. MR. CARVEL—The objection is to the water and not to the spirit.

HON. MR. FLINT—I have some further extracts which I shall quote to hon. gentlemen opposite who think they have some knowledge of the effects of drinking spirituous liquors. I will quote from authorities which the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Almon) will recognize as being of some importance. Baron Liebig, the German chemist, says :—

"If a man drinks daily eight or ten quarts of the best Bavarian beer—equal to lager beer—in the course of twelve months he will have taken into his system the nutritive constituents contained in a five pound loaf of bread."

That certainly could not keep a man alive if he drank beer all the time and got nothing else. Professor Draper says :—

"All kinds of inebriating beverages contain, as a general thing, from four to fifty per cent. of alcohol, and sometimes more of this poison. And though the balance is water it is no very uncommon circumstance for a person to fall down dead after drinking a pint of whiskey or brandy."

I have known that myself.

"The effect in some instances, is as fatal as prussic acid. Dr. Percy injected two and a half ounces of alcohol into the stomach of a dog, which gave immediately a loud, plaintive cry, and fell lifeless. Never, says Dr. Percy, "did I see every spark of vitality more effectually or instantaneously extinguished."

HON. MR. PLUMB—It was hard on the dog.

HON. MR. FLINT—It is hard on the man, too. I would rather be the dog than be the man.

"It would be difficult," says Dr. Gordon, "to find a more destructive poison than ardent spirits."

Dr. Johnson says, "Prussic acid and ardent spirits are equally poison." You may ask, "Do you wish it to be understood that a simple glass of beer is a poison?" Emphatically, yes! Beer and all kinds of malt liquors contain, on an average, not less than 4 per cent. of alcohol, though there are malt liquors that contain as much as 8 and 10 per cent. Whatever is injurious in ardent spirits is contained in beer. The only difference between distilled spirits and malt liquors is one of degree. It is a great mistake to think that malt liquors are less injurious than brandy or whiskey. The ingredients of malt liquor seem to produce an unnatural thirst. Some men will drink a couple of gallons of ale or beer in a day, and the alcohol contained will be almost equal to a quart of brandy or whisky.

The regular users of malt liquors are the most unhealthy class of drinkers, for a very slight injury or a simple disease often proves fatal. "A copious London beer-drinker," says Dr. Grinrod, "is all one vital part. He wears his heart upon his sleeve, bare to a death-wound, even from a rusty nail or the claw of a cat." The worst patients in the Metropolitan hospital are the London draymen. Though they are apparently models of health and strength, yet, if one of them

receives a serious injury, it is nearly always necessary to amputate, in order to give him the most distant chance of life. The draymen have the unlimited privilege of the brewery cellar. Sir Ashley Cooper was called to a drayman. He was a powerful, fresh-colored, healthy-looking man, who had suffered an injury in his finger, from a small splinter off a stave. The wound, though trifling, suppurated. He opened the small abscess with his lancet. He found, on retiring, he had left his lancet. Returning for it he found the man in a dying condition. The man died in a short time. Dr. Gordon says, "The moment beer-drinkers are attacked with acute diseases, they are not able to bear depletion, and die." Dr. Edwards says of beer-drinkers, "Their diseases are always of a dangerous character, and, in case of accident, they can never undergo even the most trifling operation with the security of the temperate. They most invariably die under it."

I will read no more of those extracts. I do not suppose it is necessary to do so, and what I have read is quite enough to show at all events that those eminent physicians believe that liquor in any shape is injurious to health, and I agree with them. There has been a great deal said pro and con in reference to this question, and most of us have had thrust into our boxes envelopes containing views of various individuals, and we have all had an opportunity of reading them. I know there is a difference of opinion even amongst the clergymen on this subject.

HON. MR. GLASIER—Doctors differ, also.

HON. MR. FLINT—No doubt doctors differ, too, and the patients die.

HON. MR. ALMON—The hon. gentleman has demolished the light wine and ale, but he has not explained what the injurious effects of cider are.

HON. MR. FLINT—The hon. gentleman ought to know at his time of life that cider will make a man drunk. If he does not know it I do. You take a barrel of cider fresh from the press, put it out of doors in the cold and let it freeze until only the cider in the middle is left. Bottle that up and put six raisins in each bottle, and in 6 months afterwards the hon. gentleman will find that a bottle of it would knock him endways.

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—Then it would be fermented.

HON. MR. FLINT—I do not know; but whether it is fermented or not, this amendment would not prevent the use of it. I know a man who lives on the Bay of Quinte who used to drink cider until it made him tight. One day, while under the influence of cider, he went out to feed the hogs, mistook his way and would have been drowned in the bay if his wife had not followed him and pulled him out.

I wish now to refer to what has been stated on this question by some clergymen and others. And first I come to a letter emenating from his Grace the R. C. Archbishop at Toronto, in which he condemns the Scott Act. I dare say you have all seen *Grip's* caricature comparing the liquor traffic to a mad dog.

HON. MR. PLUMB—He caricatured the Senate, too.

HON. MR. FLINT—And I think he did it justice; I am willing to take my share of it. But while the Archbishop at Toronto is opposed to the Scott Act, other prelates of the same church take the opposite view, and we can set one against the other. I happen to hold in my hand the Scott Act, as published by the Archbishop at Quebec. He has given it his official signature, and I think we can fairly set off one Archbishop against the other. I find also that several of the R. C. Clergymen in the province of Quebec endorse the Scott Act and wish their people to adopt it. Bishop Lafleche and the Bishop of Sherbrook have given it their approval, and they say:—

"The recent elections in the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska, where Catholics are in large majority, were won principally through the exertions of devoted and enlightened priests. Bishop Lafleche, of Three Rivers, and Bishop Racine, of Sherbrooke, among other high authorities, have given their active help to promoting the success of the Scott Act. In the Arthabaska election, the French-Catholic clergy issued a stirring appeal to the electors to vote for the Act, and we quote a few paragraphs here:—

"'Compatriots, to the poll, without fail! Let your vote be given to God, our Master,—and not to our enemy, Satan, as the liquor sellers and their miserable friends would like. Let your vote be given to temperance, in

favor of the Scott Act. Go, and may God protect you!'"

This document is signed by "J. N. Heroux, archipretre, cure of St. Christopher; Ls. Pottrier, archipretre, cure of Warwick; E. Lafleche, priest, cure of Ste. Victorie; O. Manseau, priest, cure of Tingwick;" and several others.

It is obvious, therefore, that the clergy hold divergent opinions on that subject, but we will go a little further; I wish to give the opinion of Cardinal Manning, who is, I believe, a high dignitary of the Church in England. At a great temperance congress in Liverpool, last fall, one of the chief speakers was Cardinal Manning, head of the Catholic community in the British Isles. His Eminence declared himself uncompromisingly on the side of prohibition. Here are the words:

"I admit that a Maine Law may be called an extreme remedy; but have I not already proved that there is an extreme evil? And, if temporizing measures will not remedy the evil, let us have an extreme remedy. I charge upon this drink-traffic nine-tenths of the misery and distress and wicked homes of our people. . . . . So long as the revenue is raised upon intoxicating drinks, I hold that we all are partakers of the crime and the misery, and the disease and cruelty, and the evils of the body and soul in time and eternity, which are caused in such prolific abundance by the trade in strong drink!"

Cardinal Manning, in speaking of the liquor traffic, declared:

"It is mere mockery to ask us to put down drunkenness by moral and religious means, when the legislatures facilitate the multiplication of the incitements to intemperance on every side. You might as well call upon me as the captain of a sinking ship, and say, "why don't you pump the water out," when you are scuttling the ship in every direction."

I think he could not have made it stronger than that. Now, I will not quote the opinions of the Ministers of other churches. It is not necessary that I should do so. I know that a great many of them are in favor of the Temperance Act, while some of them are opposed to it. But the question is simply this—is the liquor traffic an evil or is it not? That is the question which we should decide candidly and fairly. If it is an evil, then we should do all in our power to legislate it away instead of endeavoring to foster it in the way we are doing in this House. I will just read you a short extract which I have taken from a Toronto paper on the subject of whiskey peddling:—

WHISKEY PEDLERS' PROFITS.

Toronto, Jan. 31.—A number of whiskey pedlers on the Canadian Pacific Railway construction camps north of Lake Superior, have struck Toronto for the double purpose of having a good time and purchasing fresh supplies of liquor for next season. One of them told a reporter that a great deal of whiskey he sold came down from Port Arthur in tin boxes packed in sugar-barrels and was doctored after it got to the north shore. High-wines diluted with water, "flavored" with pain killer, was sold to the navvies at $2 to $3 per bottle, or 25 cents a drink. One pointed to 6 barrels which he was taking up into Muskoka, and as he stood on the platform ready to go aboard the train he remarked: "There's $500 profit for me in them six, and don't you forget it."

When we find that men can go so deliberately to work to adulterate liquor and sell it for the sake of making money, it is high time that we should take every step that we possibly can to do away with it.

HON. MR. NELSON—That is a part of the country where prohibition exists.

HON. MR. SMITH—How can you tell whether that statement you have read is true or not?

HON. MR. FLINT—How can you tell whether your petitions are all right or not?

HON. MR. SMITH—I say the signatures cannot be questioned.

HON. MR. FLINT—The hon. gentleman has given his word that they are all right and I do not dispute it. This article concludes as follows:—

A camel will work for 7 or 8 days without drinking. In this he differs from some men who will drink 7 or 8 days without working.

Having gone thus far, I must now come down to the speech of my hon. friend below me (Mr. Smith), and I shall endeavor to deal with it in a way that will astonish him; but whether he is astonished or not, I shall endeavor to treat it fairly My hon. friend spoke on the subject of vested rights. I have already referred to that, and it is not necessary for me to say anything more on the subject. I do not believe there is any vested right in the liquor

traffic at all, and if my hon. friend were to take it to the Supreme Court or to the Privy Council in England, he would find that there was no vested right in the liquor traffic. The hon. gentleman said :—

"If the temperance people would advocate their cause in a moderate way, I, as one who has served this country for upwards of fifty-two years, would be with them. Standing in my place here to-day, I can say that I have never advocated intemperance."

I do not suppose the hon. gentleman has, but he no doubt has dealt in liquor. That was his business as I understand—if I am incorrect he can tell me so. As a matter of course, the more liquor he sold the more profit he had, and I ask what kind of temperance would he give us? Will the hon. gentleman, between now and next session of Parliament, lay down a platform such as he is satisfied will be in the best interests of the country? If he can do so and convince me that he is correct in the principles which he would advocate, I certainly am prepared to go with him, because my object is, to get at the best method of doing away with the liquor traffic; but I cannot see how it will be done away with if we continue to permit the sale of liquor. However, he may give me more light on that subject, and if he does, I shall be happy to receive it. He says: "The liquor dealer comes honestly by his business." No one says that he does not. A man cannot sell liquor without a license. If he does sell without a license, he sells it dishonestly. The man who gets his license is selling it honestly, by Act of Parliament; but while he is doing so, is he not doing damage to his fellow creatures? If he is, then I say he should not sell it any longer. The hon. member speaks of the men who received their hotels from their fathers. Now, I have been a close observer of hotel and saloon keepers for many long years—I may say for more than sixty years, and with the exception of two or three instances, have never known the trade of the father to descend to the son. As a general thing, the sons have either become themselves inebriates, or they have left home altogether. They do not take up their father's business. Some of them will not stay at home to sell the liquor. I have known instances where they would not; they would rather work for the farmers or do anything than engage in the liquor traffic; and, therefore, so far as that goes, I do not think the hon. gentleman's argument has much force. The hon. gentleman spoke about my selling liquor. I can say to the hon. member in the first place, that while I was engaged as a clerk in my father's establishment, I, of course, had to sell liquor for him, but I can tell him further, that the moment I left my father's establishment I never sold a glass of liquor, and never would have anything to do with it. I even refused to sell liquor in my father's establishment some 6 months before I left it, which annoyed him very much. I could not bear the idea of having a man come in with a tin pail, when I was waiting on decent respectable ladies, and say to me with an oath, "give me a quart of whiskey."

HON. MR. SMITH—But you told your father to sell it wholesale, and make more money by it.

HON. MR. FLINT—I did, to get rid of it. I told him this, I would never sell any more whiskey for him, but he said, "will you sell out the barrels now on tap? I said "no!" I said, "I will tell you what I will do; I will gauge it, and sell it all before night," and so I did, at the rate he had sold it by the quart, and after that I never sold any more.

HON. MR. SMITH—But you sold the liquor by the barrel.

HON. MR. FLINT—Was not that better than to retail it?

HON. MR. SMITH—No, not according to your principles.

HON. MR. FLINT—Had I owned the barrels I would have knocked the heads in and let the liquor run away and made a bonfire of the barrels. The hon. gentleman speaks of the old-fashioned country taverns going out of existence. I am glad to hear of it; it is a good thing that they are going out of existence; but I can tell the hon. member that I have travelled perhaps as much as any other member of this body; I have had to make my home very often at those country taverns, and I know that, taking them as a general thing,

with rare exceptions, there is no rest or peace to any traveller that enters them. In country places the neighbors come in after night and have a jollification until three or five in the morning before they go away, and even in some of our most respectable hotels in large villages—villages that will soon become towns—it is a fact that you can get no rest, day or night, from the rowdyism at such places.

The hon. gentleman spoke of the effects of the Scott Act upon the farming industry, and mentioned particularly its effects upon the sale of barley. I think I have written sufficient upon the subject to convince any man that the quantity of barley consumed in this country is but a small proportion of the amount raised. There is a little over 1,000,000 bushels in this country consumed in making beer; and we all know what a small part that is of the entire quantity of barley raised. The greater part of our barley is sold in the United States or shipped to the old country, and if in those countries the people were to give up their beer, of course the trade in barley would diminish; but even if it did, the farmer could raise other kinds of grain. They did not get a very good price for last year's crop of barley, and it is very probable that if they do not diminish the production it will go still lower this year. It is the fault of the farmers themselves when they do not get better prices for their products, because they should limit the production to suit the demand.

The hon. gentleman said there was not 5 per cent. of drunken men in the city of Toronto. I do not know if there is; but if there is one per cent. it is just one per cent. too many. The value of one soul is greater than the whole city of Toronto, and it is most unfortunate indeed if one soul in the city of Toronto is lost through drunkenness. The question is simply this—what shall we do to prevent the people from going down to destruction through drunkenness? My hon. friend had a good deal to say about the effect of the Scott Act on the tavern keepers; he spoke about their families being turned out of doors through its operation. He pleaded hard for the liquor dealers who, in his opinion, were going to be ruined, but he never said a word to us about those who have been turned out on the streets through the liquor traffic. Supposing the hon. member should bring before us all the liquor dealers in Toronto and set them in battle array; supposing he should place at their head the gentleman who came down here covered with gold chains and jewels to the value, as was stated, of $1,800, what is that compared with the array on the other side? His jewelery was worth $1,800; that is the price of 36,000 glasses of whiskey, at five cents a glass, and he would have to sell more than that number of glasses to make the profit of $1,800. That amount of money would have bought 18,000 loaves of bread, at 10 cents a loaf, for the poor people of Toronto. I want to know which would be the better way to invest the money—which would do the greatest amount of good? That is a question which we should decide calmly and candidly. Now, so far as that is concerned, I will say no more on the subject, but I will ask the hon. gentleman to marshall his forces, and array them with their gold chains, rings and fine clothes. Then let him bring up the drunkards that are now in Toronto, their wives and their children and place them in another row; then let him take the widows and orphans of those who have died within the last ten years from the effect of the liquor traffic in Toronto—let him place them there clad in their rags, with their haggard faces and their emaciated bodies—let him array them before these tavern-keepers and say then where the charity should begin, whether it should begin with the liquor dealers, because some of them happen to fail in their business through the operation of the Scott Act, or with those who are suffering and who are dying from day to day from starvation and misery produced by drunkenness? Let him put one against the other and then he will see, as he never saw before, the terrible effects of the liquor traffic. But I will go further. Let him bring, if he could, those who have gone down to drunkard's graves, and place them there before the liquor dealers and see what has been the effect of this traffic on men. Let them tell him what they think of the liquor dealers; let those who have gone to perdition point to these men and say: "You, and you, and you are the men who enticed us to enter

your saloons; you took our money from us and made us drunkards, you dragged us down from one step to another until some of us committed suicide and others died in delirium tremens, from the liquor you sold us; and our wives and children have been made beggars because you took the last money we had for liquor and sent us home without a cent in our pockets to buy bread for our famishing families. I am drawing a true picture, and I wish hon. gentlemen to look at it in its proper light. With the experience I have had, dealing with people of all classes, I know I am right when I say that all these evils proceed from the liquor traffic; that being the case, I want to know if we are prepared to allow this destruction to go on unchecked because perhaps some families amongst those who are connected with the liquor traffic may be injured by the operation of the Scott Act. The difference between the liquor dealer and the drunkard is that the drunkard has lost everything, and the liquor dealer has taken it; and if he has not accumulated sufficient to maintain him, it is his own fault. I know it is said that people need not go to the taverns to drink, but those who have a slight inclination that way are enticed to such places, and induced to drink until all their money is spent, and then they are turned out of doors into the gutter. I knew a man who had as good a 240-acre farm as lay on the banks of the St. Lawrence. Under the old system, the son was the heir at law. On the death of his father he became the owner of the farm, of the large stock of cattle, of the grain and hay accumulated from the harvest, and $200 in cash in the house. The very day his father died he went to a hotel in Brockville, and one year from that date I saw him kicked out of that hotel having lost everything that had been left him. He raised himself on his elbow and said, "A year ago to-day, I went to your house and the best room was placed at my disposal; now, when you have got everything that I owned you tell me 'get out you drunken dog.'" I have seen such things and my heart is steeled against the liquor dealer in consequence.

In conclusion, I wish to say to you that I would prefer to take the veriest drunkard in the street, to clothe him and try to restore him to his right mind and save his soul, than to have all the plaudits of the liquor dealers in the universe. I care neither for their praise nor their blame, but I will do what I can to promote the cause of temperance and although I see plainly that our opponents have the advantage of us here, yet the day will come when we will succeed and the liquor traffic will be banished from the land.

HON. MR. DEVER—I rise to avail myself of my privilege to speak of the principle, the details, and some of the arguments of gentlemen on this Bill, and in doing so would ask permission to give a short sketch or history of this terrible "Sphinx," this frightful "Scare-Crow," this dangerous "Goblin," commonly known as wine, spirit, alcohol.

First, then, from the best information I can find, wine was known to the ancients. Noe, who was a great favorite of Deity, planted a vineyard, and he drank of the wine and was made drunken, or drunk, Gen., 9 chap., and 20, 21 verses, an event supposed to have happened 2,344 years before the birth of Christ, or 4,229 years to this date.

Wines and fermented liquors are also mentioned by the earlier profane historians, but the exact period at which they were first submitted to the art of distillation is not clearly settled.

By some, the Chinese are thought to have possessed the earliest knowledge of the process; others think that the northern nations of Europe were the first who were acquainted with the art.

Herodotus (the father of history) mentions "date spirit" as an article of commerce in Babylonia (B. C. 445), and Albucasis in the 12th century taught the method of procuring spirit from wine, but the secret was doubtless known long before that time. Raymond Lully, in the 13th century, showed the way to concentrate it by means of carbonate of potassa, after which time it gradually rose into note as an article of trade and commerce, and to-day more capital is perhaps embarked in wines, brewing, and distillation than in any similar branch of business. It may be asked here what is alcohol, chemically speaking? I will answer, it is oxygen, hydrogen, and carbon, and is latent in all

vegetable juices containing saccharine matter capable of conversion into sugar. It is a principal part of all wine, brandy, gin, rum and whiskey, and these four latter, at proof by Sikes hydrometer, contain about half their bulk of alcohol, the other half being water, or in other words, 49 parts alcohol and 51 parts water. Alcohol may be procured by distillation from all fermented liquors, and when drawn from wine, as in France, is called brandy; when from the juice of the sugar cane, raw sugar or molasses, it is called rum; when from grain alone, it is called whiskey, in Britain and in the United States, but in Holland it is called gin, or geneva, when flavored with the juniper berry.

These different liquors now mentioned consist of dilute alcohol, having in solution, various small quantities of essential oils, and coloring matter. It is the presence and different proportions of these ingredients which give them their distinguishing names or character, and by subsequent rectification, alcohol of equal strength and purity, can be procured from all of them. In conclusion, I may say, that the sugar and grain we use in all our food every day, contain—in a latent state—from 20 to 40 per cent. of alcohol, whilst our bodies, in a healthy state, perform the function of distillation by generating and throwing off the component parts of it, from morning till night. Hence alcohol used with wisdom, commingled with plenty of water—as in wine—can be taken in safety by those who want it. But gentlemen, the mere use of alcohol, for drinking purposes, is but a small part of this great industry, as the manufacturer, the chemist, and the thinker well know. But to the extremists, and cranks, on this subject, the value to labor, to the husbandman, to the wine-grower, and to the general wealth and commerce of nations, is of no consequence: they are made rabid by a blind and mistaken frenzy, and are "barking up the wrong tree" to stop drinking habits.

In other countries, the harvest of wine is looked on as one of the greatest gifts of God to man, as the following prayer at storing it sets forth. This prayer says:—

"O, Lord God, thou who lovest mankind, direct thine eyes to this wine and those who drink it; bless our vessels, thrice blessed as the walls of Jacob, and the pool of "Siloam," and as thou hast blessed this drink of the apostles, O, Lord thou who wast present at the wedding in Cana, of Galilee, and by changing water into wine revealed thy glory to thy disciples, send thy Holy Spirit on this wine, and bless it in thy name."

In the Island of Madeira alone the harvest of wine consists of 30,000 pipes, some of it valued at £100 a pipe. But what may we put down to the world's wealth in wine, beer, and spirit for France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, the British Isles, the West Indies, and now the United States? May we not fairly say it is beyond our comprehension? and yet those people speak as glibly about this vast industry as if talking against some petty gambling house.

Surely they had better see themselves as others see them, and cease their prating till they become better informed what wine and spirit are?

My honored friend from Belleville, (Mr. Flint) I cannot allow his statement to go to the public uncontradicted, that wines are not as good now, as they were in other days. I say they are better and finer now, than they ever were before, if you go to the price for them, because nature's laws are better known now, than they were formerly. What were imputed in other days to the supernatural are known now to be fixed laws that man can handle, and appropriate with art and skill to suit his purposes. Such is the conversion of sugar into wine or alcohol; water into steam, as a vast motive power for ships and railroads; electricity into an instantaneous messenger, the world over, the telephone and the electric light. But to men who are blindly obstinate it is useless to talk; they have their faith, yes "fanatic faith, once wedded fast to some dear error, they hug it to the last." I am sorry to see gentlemen who have seats in this Senate, where we are supposed to be men of some information, send forth statements that might do very well in lumber camps, but are wholly unfit to be placed before gentlemen who have any pretentions to knowledge. I have reference to the speech of the hon. gentleman from Belleville especially, (Mr. Flint.) He says, "I would tell the hon. gentlemen if they will give us such wine to-day as our Saviour made at Cana, of Galilee, I will go in for it, but I do not go in for stinking, poisonous whiskey, mixed with dirty water and logwood that they

call wine; I want the pure juice of the grape, such as our Saviour made, and if I could get that I would be willing to drink it." The question might be asked here would the hon. gentleman know it if he saw it? I rather think not. Yet the hon. gentleman would condescend to partake of "the wine of the gods," though it might not be amiss to remind the hon. gentleman that ordinary people ought to be satisfied with common fare.

"Sweet virgin can alone the fair express,
Fair by degrees and beautifully less;
But let the hoiden rough hewn vurgin
Engross the homage of a major sturgeon."

Coarse wine ought to satisfy coarse people. I also differ with my hon. friend (Mr. Vidal) about his sumptuary laws. I contend that wines, beer and spirit are food, and are given and taken by invalids to recruit them, and that his Scott Act seeks to regulate them as to price and difficulty of obtaining them, and therefore that we are right in calling it a sumptuary law on this account, and on the other that you deprive people of what thay want to eat and drink sumptuously of, at a fair price. I would also remind the hon. gentleman that the state of Maine does not seem any more moral than any place else, notwithstanding its extreme position on the temperance question, if we may judge by the number of divorce cases reported, and which are as follows:—

"Rev. S. R. Dyke, secretary of the New England Divorce Reform League, delivered a lecture in Centre Church, this evening, in which interesting statistics were given, showing the increase of divorce—not only in the New England States, but also in other parts of the United States. In Connecticut, there were, in 1849, but 91 divorces, but there are, now, an average of 440 divorces each year. Over 6,000 women die in the United States, each year, from attempts to destroy unborn children.

"In Connecticut, the ratio of divorces to marriages was 1 in 10; in Vermont, 1 in 13; in Massachusetts, 1 in 21; in New Hampshire, 1 in 9; and in Maine, about the same number, while in Rhode Island it was 1 in 10."

We might well say here, they had better turn their attention to this deplorable state of morality, and let minor laxity of habits alone.

I will now, hon. gentlemen, proceed to discuss the principle and details of the Bill, and will say that I always opposed the Scott Act as a piece of legislation not to be tolerated by freemen: not that I favor intemperance, for I am not an admirer of drunkards. In fact, I rather look on the drunkard who befouls his body with excess of drink, as being worthy of contempt. But I would ask, on what authority do these people expect to compel us, to their ideas, of what we shall not eat, or what we shall not drink, when we have to pay for it ourselves? Are we to be considered as felons, to be fed on bread and water, to please these people?

Who are those apostles who assume more arbitrary power, to preach their little gospel, than did the Lord of the Scriptures himself?

Paul, who claimed to be converted by a miracle, going to Damascus, took no such liberty with the people. but reasoned them into his doctrine and morals, and advised "to not still drink water, but to use a little wine for the stomach's sake." Christianity then went on gently, as it should: but how was it when it got the influence of the State? We all know, gentlemen, history tells us; and here, I exclaim against no particular church more than another—they are all inclined to be intolerant when they get exclusive statutary law to back them up, so would the Scott Act men (if they had the power). I would, therefore, say keep them down to simple persuasion. But these people are not satisfied with eating and drinking what please themselves, but want to deprive others from enjoying the fruits of the earth as given them by nature's God. They are as dogs in the manger and forget that what is one man's meat is another man's poison. They also forget good breeding—and here let us see what good breeding says on this point It says:—

"Every gentleman has wine on his table when he has invited guests. Indeed, wine is considered an indispensable part of a good dinner, to which a gentleman has been formally invited, even you are a total-abstinence man yourself, you will not, if you are a gentleman, attempt to compel your guests to be so, against their will. If you are so fanatical that you have what is called 'conscientious scruples' against furnishing wine, then you should invite none to dine who are not as fanatical and bigoted as yourself. You must consider that a gentleman may have 'conscientious scruples' against dining with you on cold water, for there are even temperate and sober

gentlemen who would go without meat as soon as be deprived of their glass of wine at dinner.

"The vegetarian who would force his guests to dine on cabbages, turnips and onions is hardly guilty of a greater breach of etiquette than the total-abstinence fanatic, who would compel his guests to go without wine."

These people are like the fanatics and witch burners of the 16th century, who burned some one hundred thousand eight hundred witches in France, Germany and other places, in their wild idea of doing good. People get crazy, hon. gentlemen, on subjects that are too abstruse for them.

I heard of some ladies lately who, anxious to appear on the platform, to speak on this subject, actually passed a resolution advising clergymen to use no wines for sacramental purposes, only unfermented wine. And these are the kind of people who want to force the new religion of coercion on us, people who do not know what they are talking about, for if they did they would certainly know there never was, nor cannot be, such a thing as unfermented wine. But who ask for this Bill, this "apple of discord" amongst the people, and want to inform the world that we must be great drunkards to require such a Bill? Certainly not the voters or thinkers of this country, for if they did by petition or vote, I, for one, would cheerfully give it to them. It was argued by another hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) that we should retain this Act because some wines and spirit are spurious and adulterated. I can tell the hon. gentleman that wines and spirit are no more adulterated now than they ever were, since they became an article of commerce. They are no more, if as much, adulterated as butter, cheese, sugar, tea, cream of tartar, spices, coffee, milk, &c.; and are we not to use any of these articles of food because some dishonest people adulterate them? Is not our best plan to pass a good inspection and license law which will enable the Government to see after people who deal in such goods?

But what will the Scott Act end in if continued? It will end in the destruction of vast industries affecting the revenue, the farmer, the trader, the general business and then be displaced by a license law, after a period of anarchy, ill-will, and perhaps bloodshed.

And let us see what loss these gentlemen want to bring on the farmers, brewers, distillers, shop-keepers, merchants, workmen, ships, rents, schooners, railroads, loss of commerce with other countries, and narrow trade policy. Then the loss of industry in the manufacture of vinegar, liniment of various kinds, washes for the hair, burning fluid, preserving animal bodies, duties of excise, on spirit, beer and malt, which, in 1884, aggregated $4,030,-110, the grain used in spirit alone being 75,095,450 pounds weight. And there is no limitation to the quantity we should grow and use for spirit, beer and malt, to be exported if properly looked after in this vast grain growing country of ours.

In 1883, we exported 45,218,572 pounds weight of Malt, but the year 1884, only 8,022,606 pounds weight, and the Scott Act men want to bring the industry of the country down lower. Certainly, the farmers and all others interested, must be delighted with such people, when these facts come to be known.

We exported in 1884, barley alone 7,780,262 bushels, valued at $5,104,642 but if manufactured and shipped to other countries, gentleman can see the advantages would accrue to the industry and trade of the country. But what care they about the loss and disruption of trade? Are not these gentlemen great reformers? What care they about driving poor men into bankruptcy and pauperism; are not these people great philanthropists, and some of their nearest relations, they say, died from the effects of the demon. They can tell nice little stories, too, on the platform to libel their neighbors. They take pride in smashing other people's property. They sing psalms, and the end justifies the means.

"O, Liberty, sole passion of the generous heart! thou who art the life of commerce and the inspiration of noble deeds; thou who canst be loved but with rapture; thou who art the first aspiration of youth, and the sublime invocation of old age; thou, Liberty, who, after having broken their chains, wilt conduct the last slaves, with palm branches in hands, amid hymns of glory, at the latest funeral of despotism and fanaticism."

Gentlemen, I will vote against the Scott Act, with all its accompanying espionage, pimps and spies, as being an insult to commerce, true liberty and true temperance.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I have a good deal of hesitation in undertaking to address the House in my prosy way, after the very eloquent and poetic remarks of my hon. friend from St. John; but I rise, under a sense of duty, to move the amendment of which I gave notice some time ago. The substance of that amendment is to require a three-fifths vote of the electors in a district to bring the Canada Temperance Act into operation, instead of a bare majority as at present.

I do not propose to discuss the principle of the Canada Temperance Act at any length; but one or two suggestions have occurred to me from the speech of the hon. gentleman from the Trent division. That hon. gentleman seems to feel, as a great many enthusiasts in the cause of temperance feel, that total abstinence from intoxicating liquor is not only a virtue, but is almost the only virtue that is worth advocating. Those gentlemen also seem to feel that all who do not agree with them in thinking that the proper way to bring about the adoption of temperance principles is by prohibitive legislation, are enemies of temperance, and friends of intemperance. I began almost to feel, when the hon. gentleman drew that awful picture of the drunkard in—Sheol, I suppose we must call it, since the issue of the revised edition of the Old Testament—when the hon. gentleman drew that picture of the drunkard's soul in tortures, and his widow and children in misery on this side of the grave, that I was responsible for that state of things if I did not, to use a common expression, go the whole animal. I wish to say that this is all a mistake. I believe that temperance in everything is a virtue, temperance in eating as well as in drinking; and I venture to say that there is probably as much harm done in the world by eating too much, and eating improper food, as there is by drinking too much and drinking improper drinks. That theory, which occurred to me some time ago, is borne out by a very high authority. I find that in the last number of the Nineteenth Century, Sir Henry Thompson publishes an article on Diet, and that most eminent authority avows it is his conviction "that more mischief in the form of actual disease, of impaired vigor, and of shortened life, accrues to civilized men from erroneous habits in eating than from the habitual use of alcoholic liquors," great as he deems that to be. "I am not sure," he adds, "that a similar comparison might not be made between the respective influences of those agencies in regard of moral evils also."

I do not intend to pursue that any further, but I wish to state that that is my opinion. Now, as to the Scott Act itself, it is just an instance of a kind of legislation which is contrary to the true principles of liberty. My own idea of freedom has always been—my idea of the best government, the freest government—is that which allows to every individual and every family, to every little hamlet or settlement, to every township, county or province, and so on, working up from the individual to the largest community, the utmost amount of liberty and self government that is consistent with the safety and general welfare of the whole state. There is nothing novel about that; it is the English idea of liberty as distinguished from the idea of liberty that is entertained in other places. We find that, on the continent, when they establish a republic, the men who attain power immediately begin to hinder the people who happen to be in the minority from exercising their own free judgment, or free thought, or free action. In England and in kindred countries—the United States, for instance—where English ideas prevail, it is altogether different.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—In this case it is the minority that proposes to hinder the majority, so far as I can see.

Hon. Mr. POWER—This theory, I think, finds expression in that saying that "the Englishman's house is his castle." The English theory is that the public have no right to go into a man's house and to interfere with his private life or private affairs, even though he is misconducting himself, unless his evil-doing interferes with the public in a substantial way. The public do not undertake to interfere in the case of a man's follies and vices, other than that of intemperance in drinking; and I think that as long as those follies and vices affect only the man himself, and do not affect the public at large directly, the public have no right to interfere with him.

When it becomes a case of direct injury to his neighbors, then, of course, the public have the right to interfere.

HON. MR. McINNES (B. C.)—Does not the law direct that a person not able to take care of himself, and who is likely to destroy himself by poison, or some weapon, authorize the officials of the land to step in and take possession of that individual, even in his own house?

HON. MR. POWER—I do not exactly catch the point of the question.

HON. MR. McINNES—You say the law of the land has no right to interfere with a man in his own house, even if he is doing wrong. We have laws on the statute books that authorize the officials to go into a man's house and take possession of a man who is incapable of taking care of himself, or is liable to destroy his own life or to inflict injury upon others.

HON. MR. POWER—If a man is insane he becomes a source of danger to the lives of the people around him.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Here they propose to adopt this course towards everybody else.

HON. MR. POWER—I hope the House will excuse me if I quote from one or two well known authorities on the point. Blackstone, who, though a little old, is looked upon as a very good authority, says :—

"That system of laws is alone calculated to maintain civil liberty, which leaves the subject entire master of his own conduct, except in those points wherein the public good requires some direction and restraint."

I quote this because hon. gentlemen may think that because a man is doing what they think is a wrong thing, they have a right to step in and interfere with his conduct, when he does not interfere with his neighbors at all. There is a quotation from John Stuart Mill, on Liberty, which I presume most hon. gentlemen have seen. I take it from a very able pamphlet, which has been distributed, entitled, "Shall I vote for the Scott Act?" It is as follows :—

"There is a limit to the legitimate interference of collective opinion with individual independence; and to find that limit, and maintain it against encroachment, is as indispensable to a good condition of human affairs as protection against political despotism.'

"There are in our own day gross usurpations upon the liberty of private life actually practised, and still greater ones threatened with some expectation of success, and opinions propounded which assert an unlimited right in the public, not only to prohibit by law everything which it thinks wrong, but to prohibit a number of things which it admits to be innocent. Under the name of preventing intemperance, the people of one English colony, and of nearly half of the United States, have been interdicted by law from making any use whatever of fermented drinks, except for medicinal purposes; for prohibition of their sale is in fact as it is intended to be, prohibition of their use."

"There are questions relating to interference with trade which are essentially questions of liberty; such as the Maine law. * * * These interferences are objectionable, not as infringements on the liberty of the producer or seller, but on that of the buyer."

"The Acts of an individual may be hurtful to others, or wanting in due consideration for their welfare, without going to the length of violating any of their constituted rights. The offender may then be justly punished by opinion, though not by law." * * *

"The individual is not accountable to society for his actions, in so far as these concern the interests of no person but himself. Advice, instruction, persuasion, and avoidance by other people if thought necessary by them for their own good, are the only measures by which society can justifiably express its dislike or disapprobation of his conduct * * *

"For such actions as are prejudicial to the interests of others the individual is accountable, and may be subjected either to social or legal punishment, if society is of opinion that the one or the other is requisite for its protection."

Laws of this kind, that undertake to interfere with the private lives of citizens, have occasionally been passed in England and in English speaking countries. As far as I know they have never been successfully enforced. I do not think that there is any record of any such law having been successfully enforced. They have been most frequently enacted, and the most strenuous attempts have been made to enforce them in those portions of the United States, which are peopled by the descendants of the old Puritans. Those were the people who, having been perse-

cuted in a certain degree in England, fled from persecution there and came out to America to persecute more vigorously people whose opinions happened to differ from their own. I have said that experience goes to show that these laws have not been effectual in gaining their ends in English speaking countries, nor I believe in any other country; but I venture to go further and say that it seems to me, with respect to those prohibitory laws, or laws like the Canada Temperance Act, that even though they could be enforced they are not desirable enactments. It is not desirable and it is not necessary that we should enact any such law. As to that point—although I am afraid I am repeating what has been said already—I find in this pamphlet, to which I have already referred, a very convenient table which shows the yearly consumption of alcohol per inhabitant of the different leading countries of the world:—

DRINK OF ALL NATIONS.

	Millions of Gallons.				Alcohol per Inhabitant.
	Wine.	Beer.	Spirits.	Equivalent in Alcohol.	
United Kingdom	15	1,007	37	67·2	1·92
France	760	190	34	101·0	2·65
Germany	120	880	60	72·4	1·60
Holland	3	35	12	8·2	2·05
Belgium	4	170	10	11·4	2·07
Denmark	2	35	27	5·1	2·60
United States	30	440	76	66·5	1·31
Canada	½	13	4½	3.3	0.74

It appears from this table, taken from Mulhall's Dictionary of Statistics, that Canada really stands almost at the head of all countries in the matter of temperance.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—It stands at the head.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Yes, at the head. We know of no more temperate country. It is a mistake to suppose that any member of this House who expresses an opinion in any way hostile to the Canada Temperance Act is necessarily an enemy of temperance. In fact, the most sincere—at any rate, if not the most sincere, the most judicious friends of temperance—are on the other side. Take the practical man who has been referred to by the hon. gentleman from Trent Division, Archbishop Lynch, and what does he say about it? He says, in a letter which all honorable gentlemen have seen:

"I have, as well as my priests, exercised all my influence to suppress intemperance, and, thank God, we have no reason to be discouraged at our efforts. Drunkenness is not the besetting sin of our good Canadian people. We have less drunkenness in Canada, I think, than in any other country of the same latitude. If we had a population of a character such as is reported of that of Glasgow, Edinburgh, London, or a city in Ireland, we could then vote for any act that would suppress the terrible scandal of intemperance. I have not heard of a single county in Ontario where the people are so besotted as to require the Act. The few drunkards that are amongst us can be reformed by good nourishment and by severe punishment, and above all, by a strict inspection of intoxicating liquors."

That is the voice of reason and of common sense, and—I do not speak it in a denominational sense—of sound religion, too. We will suppose that the friends of the Canada Temperance Act had their way, and that the Act was in force all over the country; these gentlemen's occupation would be gone then. Suppose the effect of the enforcement of the Act was that no more liquor would be consumed; the probabilities are that the turn of tobacco would come after liquor; and in fact some friends of total abstinence have already devoted a little attention to tobacco.

Hon. Mr. McINNES—Quite right.

HON. MR. POWER—And a number of other harmless indulgences would follow and life would soon become a wretched desert, so that one would almost sooner be dead and done with it. I have said, and quoted the authority of Sir Henry Thompson for it, that drunkenness is not any worse than eating to excess. I am not going to deal with the Scriptural argument, but the denunciations of the glutton in Scripture are stronger, I think, than those of the drunkard. There are many other most mischievous vices. There is, for instance, a vice which, at the present day, does perhaps more harm than drunkenness—in this country, at all events. That is the vice of avarice. Why do not hon. gentlemen begin a crusade against that? It is more the vice of the present day than drunkenness; because drunkenness has ceased to be fashionable, while avarice and fraud are vices which more prevail. Take any sin in the decalogue in fact; and the picture which my hon. friend across the chamber drew of the man who indulged in drink to excess might be drawn of the man who indulged in that sin to excess. The effect of crime is ultimately to ruin a man in this world, and to imperil his chances for the next. There is no prohibition of wine in the Scriptures. I am not going to talk about that matter; but we have the best authority for the statement. Archbishop Lynch says:—

"It has been asserted that the use of wine is prohibited in the Bible. This is not the case. Our Divine Redeemer instituted one of His greatest sacraments in bread and wine; and St. Paul advises his disciple, Timothy, to use a little wine for his stomach's sake, for there are persons of weak constitutions that require such nourishment."

He endorses Archbishop Purcell on that point; and Canon Farrar, who has written a very strong article in favor of prohibitory legislation, in a recent number of the Nineteenth Century, does not pretend to say that there is any prohibition in Scripture. It has often struck me, when I have seen men who were total abstainers and were very fond of eating heartily, and did not restrain their appetites in other directions, that the words of Butler describe them with great accuracy. They

"Compound for sins they feel inclined to,
By damning those they have no mind to."

That is a very cheap and easy sort of virtue. There is one other objection which I may as well take here to those statutory enactments to make people virtuous—that their effect is to put an end to voluntary effort. The temperance people and the common sense of the country, and the exertions of the friends of humanity have done an immense deal towards promoting temperance since the beginning of the century. It was looked upon 80 years ago as the right and fashionable thing for a man to get drunk, and end his dinner under the table. That has all passed away; no man who wishes for the respect or admiration of his friends or the public can afford to be known as a man who habitually gets drunk; and intemperance is very unfashionable and very much discredited and has almost disappeared except amongst a limited class. Now, this fortunate result has not been brought about by legislation, but by the voluntary efforts of men like Father Matthew, and by the growth of education and the labors of those temperance associations which, while they limit themselves to voluntary effort, do an immense amount of good. But I have noticed this, that when these temperance people reach a certain stage in their agitation they want to get prohibitory legislation. They appear more anxious to get prohibitory legislation than to prevent drinking; and as soon as the prohibitory legislation has been obtained the tendency is to abandon moral suasion and to depend on prohibition. There is an objection in man—in the Canadian man, certainly—to coercion, and I think moral suasion will take him a great deal further than prohibitory legislation.

Some of my remarks have been based on the supposition that these laws can be enforced. They cannot be, as I have just indicated. That I think is the uniform verdict of history. I shall now quote from an article in the Popular Science Monthly by Mr. Johnston, in which he points out the total failure of the prohibitory law in the United States. Vermont is one of those states where the people are descended in a great measure from the old Puritan stock, and it is one of the four states in the Union where they have a prohibitory provision in the constitution. Mr. Johnston gives the experience of the attempt to enforce prohibition in Vermont:

"But the practical operation of this severe and sweeping law—there is the rub! It is a fact, which cannot be controverted or denied, that for all practical purposes the law is an absolute dead letter. According to the returns of the United States revenue officers, the Government tax on the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the state (Vermont) amounted last year to fourteen thousand dollars in round numbers. On the same authority, there are in the state at the present time four hundred and forty-six places where intoxicating liquors are sold; and, though the population is well-nigh stationary, there is a marked increase in the number of these places, last year's returns showing four hundred and twenty-six, and those for the preceeding year only four hundred and nine. In the city of Burlington, there are about threescore places where liquor is sold, and in Rutland, St. Albans, and all the larger towns, a proportional number; and in every village in the state, with the exception of a few inconsiderable hamlets, there is at least one such place. A large proportion of the dram-shops are located upon the principal streets, and there is no concealment or attempted concealment of the illegal traffic conducted within them. As these facts and figures sufficiently indicate, the law, broadly speaking, is not at all enforced. The sale of liquor, it is hardly too much to say, is almost as free and open as though there were no such thing as a prohibitory law. The principal exception to the general rule consists of an occasional spasmodic attempt to enforce the law in larger places, and the fining of liquor dealers on what are termed "disclosures." In the latter case, a person arrested for intoxication is compelled to "disclose" the person of whom he procured liquor, and that person is then tried for the offence. Such cases are very common, but as only the lowest class of liquor dealers is concerned in them, generally speaking, and as the prosecution is invariably for a "first offence," no effective purpose is served in repressing the liquor traffic. In the larger towns, an effort to enforce the law is occasionally made, but such efforts have invariably proved short-lived, and in almost every instance the people have, at the earliest opportunity, rejected at the polls the officers who have attempted to enforce the law. These are the principal exceptions to the general rule of non-enforcement. Of enforcing the law, as the laws against burglary and larceny are enforced, no one dreams for a moment. Such is the unsatisfactory result of Vermont's thirty years' experience of the prohibitory liquor law. I might go still further, and speak of the perjury and subornation of perjury, for which the law is in a sense responsible; of the disregard and contempt for all law which the operation of this law tends to foster and encourage, and of cognate matters which will occur to the reflective reader; but, perhaps, enough has been said in showing the failure of the law to accomplish the object for which it was enacted.

"The cause of the failure of the law is not far to seek. It is obviously that the law is not sustained by public sentiment. It is that the world can not be dragooned into virtue. The supporters of the prohibitory law are well meaning men and women, who are sincerely desirous of benefiting their fellow human beings and advancing God's kingdom upon earth: but not even by these will humanity suffer itself to be driven to loftier heights of thought and action. The people of Vermont are not singular in this matter; and there would seem to be no reason why the prohibitory system, a failure in a moral, God-fearing community, should be successful anywhere in the United States."

The experience of the state of Iowa and the other states where they have this prohibitory provision in the constitution, is the same. As Archbishop Lynch says :—

"It is difficult to enforce any moral virtue on an unwilling people. They will always claim the right of doing as they please, provided they do not injure their neighbors."

The experience of Canada is similar. I do not propose to refer to many speeches made by hon. gentlemen in this House; but there were one or two which were very suggestive upon this point. One was the speech made last year by the hon. gentleman from Charlottetown (Mr. Carvell) and the other the speech made this year by the hon. member from Marshfield (Mr. Haythorne). Both hon. gentlemen come from a province where that Act had been tried under the most favorable circumstances. The whole island is under the Act; and when one finds a gentleman like my hon. friend from Marshfield, who voted for that Act and was a believer in it, viewing it as a total failure, and giving his opinion to that effect as the result of his practical experience, that ought to to have a great deal of influence with us. The truth, as I believe, is this : that it will be found in every place or county where the prohibitory or total abstinence law has been in force the effect has been to stop the progress of temperance; that up to the time when you enact your prohibitory law the consumption of liquor becomes less and less and drunkenness diminishes, but that after the prohibitory law has been in operation for a little while the effect is to cause the consumption of liquor to increase. Perhaps some hon. gentleman might naturally ask me why I voted for the Scott Act, as it is called. The reason is this : in the province of Nova Scotia we had a prohibi-

tory law before Confederation, and before the passing of the Canada Temperance Act. That law was really to my mind a more unreasonable one than the Canada Temperance Act, and I voted for the latter Act, partly because it was a measure introduced by the Government whom I generally supported, and partly because I looked upon it as a less tyrannical measure than the one that we had in force at the time. Nova Scotia is not a very large place, but still perhaps it is large enough to try the experiment of prohibition; and the experience of Nova Scotia under the old prohibitory law justifies the views that I have expressed to-day. In the country districts, where the people were not given to drinking, and were naturally temperate, there was very little drinking under the prohibitory law; but, in the places where the people did drink, and where the law if it was good for anything was required, it did not stop drinking, but it changed the character of drinking and changed it altogether for the worse. In the debate which took place in 1878, if I am not mistaken, the friends of the Canada Temperance Act who advocated its passage admitted that the Dunkin Act had not been a success. Our experience in Canada, then, has been the same as elsewhere. The prohibitory laws in the Lower Provinces, the Dunkin Act and the Canada Temperance Act have all been failures.

The conclusion which one must draw from that—admitting that any number or proportion of the people have a right to dictate to their neighbors what they shall eat or drink—is that, unless there is an overwhelming popular sentiment in favor of the Act, the mere adoption of it does much more harm than good. In the first place, as I have already stated, the cause of temperance suffers, because voluntary effort in a great measure ceases. That is one of the first effects; then liquor is drunk under worse circumstances. When the license system is in operation, the liquor trade is under the control of law. The police have a right to go into licensed houses at all times. Liquor is sold only at certain suitable hours. It is not sold on Sundays; it is not sold to persons under a certain age; it is not usually sold to drunken men; and there is some guarantee in the character of the person who sells it that the article which he furnishes will be comparatively pure and wholesome. Inall these ways under the prohibitory law the circumstances are much worse. Liquor is sold at improper times and places. The vilest compounds are sold, and sold to minors and to drunken men, while, as a rule, a respectable man who holds a license will not sell to a man that has already taken too much. One of the worst features in the whole matter is that people grow accustomed to violating the law, and that is a most unfortunate lesson to teach the public. When a man has got into the way of thinking that he can violate this law, it is a very easy step for him to conclude that he may violate almost any other law, and that is one of the very worst effects of these enactments. Our experience shows that. The reason for the amendment I have proposed has already been made clear enough; the present system does not guarantee the existence of a preponderating sentiment in favor of the Act where it is proposed to put it in force. The passing of the Act, instead of proving that there is an overwhelming majority of the people of the district in its favor, very often indicates nothing of the sort; and it has frequently been carried by a comparatively small minority. Statistics on this point have already been submitted by the hon. gentleman from Amherst who is not here and by two or three other hon. gentleman, but I may be allowed to give some in a tabulated form:

NEW BRUNSWICK.

Name of County or City	Votes for Petition.	Votes against Petition.	Aggregate Number of Voters on Roll.	Date When Adopted.	Votes cast at last general Election.	Total Population.
Fredericton...	403	203	788	1878	3,801	6,218
York.....	1,229	214	3,483	"		24,179
Carleton.....	1,215	69	2,913	1879	3,465	23,365
Charlotte.....	867	149	4,220	"	2,802	26,087
Albert.....	718	114	2,300	"	1,507	12,359
Kings	798	245	4,499	"	3,001	25.617
Queens.....	315	131	2,579	"	1,970	14,017
Westmoreland	1,082	299	5,754	"	4,808	37,719
Northumberl'd	875	673	3,321	1880	2,969	25,109
Sunbury	176	41	1,369	1881	1,155	6,651
Total.....	7,678	2,188	32,226	....	25,478	201,291

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Prince	1,762	271	5,434	1878	4,512	34,347
Charlottetown	827	253	1,829	1879	*	11,485
Kings	1,076	59	5,678	"	3,860	26,433
Queens.....	1,317	99	6,351	1880	6,082	36,626
Total.....	4,982	682	19,287	.....	14,454	108 91

* Included in Queens.

NOVA SCOTIA.

Digby	944	42	2,882	1880	1,994	19,881
Queens	768	85	1,574	"	1,252	10,577
Shelbourne...	807	154	2,266	1881	1,687	14,913
Colchester....	1,418	184	4,147	"	3,339	26,720
Annapolis	1,111	114	3,205	"	2,798	20,598
Kings	1,478	108	3,431	"	3,064	23,469
Hants	1,082	92	3,642	"	2,727	23,359
Pictou	1,555	453	5,780	1882	5,153	35,535
Cape Breton..	739	216	3,656	1881	2,803	31,258
Inverness	960	106	3,546	1882	2,974	25,651
Cumberland..	1,560	262	4,653	1883	3,498	27,378
Yarmouth....	1,287	96	3,361	1884	2,107	21,283
Total.....	13,704	1,912	42,063	.....	33,396	280,613

The province of Ontario is the only one where there has been any respectable portion of the voters on the roll who voted for the petition. The following are the figures for the province of Ontario:

Name of County or City	Votes for Petition.	Votes against Petition.	Aggregate Number of Voters on Roll.	Date When Adopted.	Votes cast at last general Election.	Total Population.
Halton.....	1,483	1,402	4,664	1881	3,561	21,919
Oxford.....	4,073	3,208	11,327	1884	6,397	50,093
Simcoe.....	5,712	4,529	13,915	"	9,946	76,129
Stormont...)					1,967	
Dundas.....)	4,590	2,884	12,210	"	3,349	56,113
Glengarry ..)					2,775	
Bruce	4,501	3,189	12,150	"	8,242	64,774
Huron.....	5,957	4,304	13,810	"	9,290	76,970
Norfolk.....	2,781	1,694	7,005	"	6,596	33,593
Renfrew.....	1,743	1,018	5,676	"	3,751	40,125
Leeds & Gren.	5,058	4,384	10,134	"	7,755	48,661
Brant	1,690	1,088	8,063	"	4,725	24,253
Total.....	37,593	27,790	98,964	....	64,578	492,630

I think the hon gentleman from Sarnia and some other gentlemen have taken this ground—they have asked: "Why has the Act been carried, if there is not a wrong sentiment in favor of it?—Why do not the men who do not believe in the Canada Temperance Act come out and vote against it?" I think the reasons are very simple. The principal reason is this, that although this country or a portion of it is supposed to be in a very benighted condition on this question of temperance, the truth is the temperance sentiment in the country is so strong—the feeling that drinking is not a respectable thing is so strong—that men who do not believe in prohibition at all, who think that a man should be allowed to eat and drink what he pleases, will not go out to vote as they think and feel, because they suppose that it is not as respectable as to vote the other way, or to refrain from voting. The consequence is that these people stay at home I believe that is the real explanation of the small vote throughout the country. There is another fact, that you have on one side the temperance organizations, who are very influential and who are well organized. They carry on the campaign; they get people to come up and vote; while there is no regular organization on the other side, and the people do not turn out to vote against the Temperance Act. In the Lower Provinces the people are hard to move. It is difficult to get them to vote at an election for a member of the House of Commons, and if a man is not asked to go he generally will not take the trouble. I think these are sufficient reasons for the apparent majority in favor of the Act in the Lower Provinces. I feel quite safe in saying that if of those who vote you cannot get three-fifths to vote in favor of this Act, there can be no popular sentiment in favor of it; and if there is no popular sentiment in its favor you cannot enforce it; and if the Act is not enforced then you have scandals such as have been described by the hon. gentlemen from Charlottetown and Marshfield, and such scandals as we read of in other places; for this reason I believe that the amendment which I have the honor to propose is an amendment in the interests of temperance and in the interest of the Canada Temperance Act itself. It will prevent the Canada Temperance Act from being put in force in places where there is no popular sentiment in favor of it. It will prevent the occurrence of these scandals which have discredited the Canada Temperance Act and enabled people to ridicule it and to point to its inefficacy. This amendment which I propose is not at all contrary to the prayer of the various petitions which have come in here asking that nothing shall be done to diminish the efficiency of the Canada Temperance Act.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Or "to render it more difficult of adoption or enforcement."

HON. MR. POWER—Those petitions should have been worded a little differently.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The hon. gentleman should quote them as they are; you are leaving out the most important word to suit your own end.

HON. MR. POWER—That is a temperance argument at once. I do not know how it is that temperance men are so extreme. If they could only be temperate in their temperance it would be much better. I had no intention to misstate the prayer of the petitioners.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I do not mean to accuse the hon. gentleman of any wrong intention. I take that back.

HON. MR. POWER—I do think, hon. gentlemen, that this amendment is in the interests of temperance and of the Temperance Act. Some of my friends have asked me why I did not choose two-thirds rather than three-fifths. The law has been in force with a bare majority; and I thought that three-fifths was about the smallest majority that would give a reasonable guarantee that the popular sentiment was in favor of the Act, and it was about the smallest proportion that would afford any guarantee against the scandals and abuses that have arisen where the Act has been put into operation by a bare majority. I beg to move the amendment of which I have given notice as follows :—

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be further amended by adding the following section thereto:

"Section fifty-six of 'The Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' is amended by substituting the words 'two-fifths' for the words 'one-half' in the first line thereof as printed; section fifty-seven of the said Act is amended by substituting the words 'three-fifths' for the word 'half' in the first line thereof as printed, and sections fifty-eight and sixty-two are amended by inserting the word 'required' before the word 'majority' whenever it occurs."

HON. MR. VIDAL moved the adjournment of the debate.

HON. MR. SMITH—I will not detain the House very long, but I could not let this opportunity pass, after the speech delivered by the hon. Senator who represents the Trent division, without making some comments on it. That hon. gentleman, in the course of his remarks, has insinuated that persons dealing in liquors would not give correct returns; that he did not believe that the returns made in counties where the Scott Act had been in force were correct. He insinuated that because those men were dealing in liquor, therefore they were not capable of giving true returns to the country. He insinuated that most distinctly. He also went on to question the honesty of these men because they were dealing in liquor. Now, that comes very badly from the mouth of a gentleman whose father had made money in that particular business. It comes very badly from a man who, up to middle age, had dealt out liquor himself by the quart, and afterwards, as a means to make more money, sold it wholesale. I am sorry to make any allusion to that personal matter, and when I do so it is not because I think any the less of that gentleman for being in the liquor trade, in his early life, nor because I think anything the less of his father before him for earning an honest living in that trade in his day, but I do think less of gentlemen who stand up here to-day and insinuate that no man could be honest and respectable if he dealt in anything in the shape of intoxicating liquor. Any gentleman who stands on the floor of this House and makes such a statement as that to the world must be thought a fanatic, and cannot have the mind of an upright, honorable man.

HON. MR. FLINT—The hon. gentleman puts words into my mouth which I never used. My speech explains that.

HON. MR. SMITH—The hon. gentleman said it in his speech.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Does the hon. gentleman from Toronto persist in bringing us back here to-night? We usually consult each other's pleasure in these debates.

HON. MR. SMITH—We have consulted the hon. gentleman's pleasure for a long time on this subject. The hon. gentleman and his friends may shuffle as much as they like, but we will consult the pleasure of the large majority of this House now, and have this vexed question settled to-night.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

THE SPEAKER—Perhaps the hon. member from Sarnia will withdraw his motion for the adjournment of the debate.

HON. MR. VIDAL—With the leave of the House, I have no objection to do so.

The motion was withdrawn.

HON. MR. SMITH—It is not my desire to detain the House at any great length, but simply to enter a protest against the language made use of by the hon. member from Trent division in regard to those who have been and are in the liquor trade. A large number of our fellow citizens have been in the liquor trade in this country for years. It is well known that the character of those merchants, as a rule, is straightforward, high-toned and honorable. It is well known that they will compare favorably with any other class of Her Majesty's subjects in the Dominion, and it is for this reason that I stand here to-night not to make any great defence, because it is unnecessary, and if it were, there are other hon. gentlemen who could do it more ably than I can, but simply to enter my protest against the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Trent, and I do so more particularly because he drew the attention of the House to the fact that I am in the liquor trade. I have been in the liquor trade to a certain extent, but it is not one-twelfth part of my business. I have been an importer of wines and liquors for the last thirty years, and I will allow the public of this country and those who are within hearing of my voice to-day to say whether I have conducted my business in an honorable, straightforward manner or not; and I am one of those liquor dealers whom the hon. gentleman from Trent division, casts a slur upon in his reference to all parties who import, sell, drink or handle intoxicating liquors in any shape or form. The man who makes such a wholesale attack upon a respectable class of people in the country where we have so many intelligent men must be considered either as a fanatic or a crank. After many years of experience in the liquor trade, I must say that I have found those who are engaged in it to be as honorable men, in every shape and form, as those who profess extreme temperance principles, and as merchants there is no comparison. As liberal, whole-souled men—men who will put their hands in their pockets and give their money freely to help their fellow citizens—there is no comparison. Liquor dealers are whole-souled men, liberal in their opinions and liberal with their money, yet they are denounced as being everything that is bad by some hon. gentlemen who have temperance on the brain. We are expected to allow our temperance friends to say what they like in this House, and we must not say a word on behalf of those who have followed an honorable calling for the last 30 or 40 years, and who have paid their debts honorably, and have always been ready to assist their neighbors and to contribute their money towards any enterprise for the public welfare. I say that is the character generally of those who deal in liquor in this country, and I am prepared to compare them, man for man, with the temperance men, and let the public decide as to which of the two classes is more valuable to the country. Which of them is it that carries on the trade of the country? Is it the temperance crank? By no means. Who is it that pays the revenue of this country? Is it the temperance crank? It may be said that this is hard language, but hard language has been used against those who have not the opportunity to defend themselves in this House. I am responsible for my language, and I am not afraid of anybody, or any power, or any class of people in this country, let them be temperance or otherwise. My record for the last 30 or 40 years will show what I have been and what I am, and, therefore, it is not necessary for me to give any further history of myself. I am still in the liquor trade, and when the day comes when age or infirmity calls me from that honest and honorable calling, I will not stand in this House or any other place and cast reflections on the calling by which I have made a portion of my living, or on those who are still in the business in this country and who pay an enormous amount of revenue into the public treasury.

I will never be the man to stand up and condemn that calling as the hon. gentleman from Trent has done. I would take stronger ground against the hon. gentleman only for the fact that his age will not

allow me to do so, because he knows well that his father before him made his money in the liquor trade, and he knows that up to a certain time, he made momey himself in that trade, and I look around me, and see many of my fellow citizens that have been in their early days importers and dealers in wines and liquors, and I do not think any the less of them because of their connection with that trade. I say that by keeping this Canada Temperance Act on our statute book we are making a large portion of our people law breakers. It encourages them to deceive the honest trader. It encourages them to deceive each other; it encourages drinking at home and in places where men would not drink but for the prohibition caused by this Act. It wipes out the pure light wines and deprives a man of the wholesome glass of beer, which the hon. gentleman said contains but four per cent. of spirit. If a glass of beer has only four per cent. of spirit in it, there is not much danger of it doing any harm to the hard-working laborer or mechanic, or any person who uses it. What does the laborer like better for his dinner than his pint of beer and his loaf of bread? What will keep better in the hot sun? What will give him more vigor to go on with his work on a warm day than his glass of ale? I say that the person who would deprive the poor person of his glass of beer is an intemperate man and will encourage intemperance to a large degree, because spirit is easily carried, easily smuggled, and easily kept concealed on the person, which cannot be done with beer. Therefore the man who will not permit the use of beer and light wines, is not acting in the cause of true temperance. We have a great many of those temperance speeches, and no doubt if we were disengaged to-night we could enjoy ourselves by hearing the celebrated temperance lecturer, Mr. J. B. Gough, a gentleman whom I have often heard lecture on this question? I like his speeches very well. A great deal that he says is correct, and if people would only do as he says it would be all very well; but to encourage those people who go to hear him to come to Parliament and ask for legislation to deprive the honest people of this country of their beer or light wine, I say is going too far, and interfering with the liberty of the subject. I say that he is going too far; he is bringing in discord, discomfort, and deceit, because the country will not observe the law. The people of every country have been accustomed from earliest ages to using liquors. In some countries spirit does not answer, and in some seasons of the year there is very little spirit drunk in this country, and the people require some light beverage such as wine or ale to satisfy them. The hon. gentleman said that the adoption of this Act would not affect the farmer, because barley that would be grown by them would be sent out of the country. Now, if he is right in principle, he will not advocate that the farmer should grow barley to sell to our American neighbors to continue the same evil that it produces here. If he is true to his principle he will say, "do not allow barley to be grown at all, because barley will make beer." The hon. gentleman does not go that far; he says he will allow our farmers to raise barley, and we will sell it to our neighbors, and let our neighbors destroy themselves as they think proper. Can any man stand up and defend such an argument?

HON. MR. DEVER—He wants the money.

HON. MR. SMITH—I say that if the principle of the sale, manufacture and use of beer from barley is wrong, then do away with the barley altogether, and do not allow the farmer to produce it or sell it for malt purposes. I contend, however, that the principle is not a correct one; I contend that the farmer ought to be encouraged to raise barley or any and every grain in which there is money in this country. By doing that, it encourages emigrants to come to and settle in this country. I will not detain the House any longer. I simply wanted to make these few remarks so that the hon. gentleman from Trent Division would not have his speech go on record without some protest, and all I can add is that I am sorry that someone in the House, who is better qualified than I am to do so, should not have made this protest. I may add that I know a number of gentlemen who advocate temperance, and who will not go to the polls and vote for it, because they consider that it is the worst thing that can happen the country if the Scott Act car-

ries. In one locality it deprives a man of the right to sell beer or light wines, and shuts up his house; while the municipality across the road, that did not adopt the Scott Act, gets all the trade, and the farmers go there where they can get accommodation. Some of those temperance gentlemen say, "We will start a temperance hotel." In my experience of the last forty years, no temperance hotel has ever succeeded in this country, and if there is a temperance hotel in a town or city or village, ten to one the temperance man will not patronize it; he will go to the licensed house, put his horse under the shed, use the premises and accommodation, and will not call for anything, but takes advantage of the accommodation he is offered, and pays nothing for it. Is that true temperance? Is that common honesty? Is it what the people of this country should practice? If you go to counties where the Temperance Act is in force, you will find the temperance men's horses are tied alongside the fences; they use the sheds of the churches, and when those places are closed against them, they drive some distance to where they get a tavern to put their horses up at. Is a British subject to be told in this couatry what he has never been told in England, that he cannot have a glass of beer or intoxicating liquor of any description? The wisdom of England has never deprived the people at home of their beer, and why should the fanatics of Canada, in the name of temperance, say that British subjects shall not be allowed their glass of beer in this country? Let us practice temperance, every man at his own table, and in his every day life, and allow the subject to use the judgement and the brains that God has given him to be temperate, honest and true, and if he will do so we will find the country prosper very much better than it would if ruled by a minority, a very small minority of temperance cranks.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I have had occasion before this to remark on the very wide departure, in the consideration of this Bill, from the expression of those thoughts and reasons which ought to be brought before us in dealing with the matter which is really now in our hands. I am quite sure that any stranger listening to our debate outside of the bar of this House this afternoon would scarcely be able to form any idea of the subject before the Senate. My hon friend who has just resumed his seat has scarcely uttered a single sentence relating to the question which is before us for decision. My hon. friend from Trent I have to put in the same category, and with the exception of the few closing remarks of the hon. gentleman whose amendment we are now considering, I should include him in the same list also, because when he considers them after they are published he will see that nine tenths of his remarks have nothing to do with the amendment which he has proposed to the Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—The remarks led up to it.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Like the creation of Adam did to our present generation. What is the question before us? It is shall this House sanction the adoption of a principle with respect to the voting on the Scott Act, which does not prevail anywhere else in this Dominion with respect to the decision of any question by the vote of the people? It is an attempt to introduce an entire novelty, and I contend that where any such thing is attempted to be introduced there should be shown to us most cogent reasons, most powerful and irresistible arguments, why such a proposal should be placed before us. It is somewhat extraordinary that such a change should have taken place in the mind of the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Power) from the views which he entertained last year. I admit the propriety of a man changing his opinion in less than 12 months if he sees a reason for doing so, but the hon. gentleman has given no reason whatever for the wonderful change which has come over his sentiments and his course of action with reference to this particular question. Last year the hon. gentleman from Amherst brought in the identical proposition that is now before us. In referring to our Journals of the 4th of April last year, I find in amendment to Sir David Macpherson's motion for the 3rd reading of a bill like this one, Mr. Dickey moved:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Com-

mittee of the Whole House, with instructions to leave out the words "half of all the votes" in the fifty-seventh section of the Act hereby amended, and substitute therefor the words "three-fifths of all the votes."

It is identically the same amendment as the one now before us. In analyzing the division on that amendment I find Mr. Power voting with myself against it. But he was not content with giving a silent vote by any means; his sentiments were expressed, as he generally expresses them, very clearly, and they were very satisfactory sentiments to me, and I have very great pleasure in reminding the hon. gentleman that his view, as expressed last year on this subject, was a very correct view, and admirably expressed, and I do not see why he changes it now. On that occasion he said:—

"There is a defect in the 96th section of the Act which hinders it from going into operation in certain cases, where the vote has been taken on it; and the sole object of this Bill is to remedy this defect, and allow the Canada Temperance Act to go into operation as it would have gone into operation if it had not been for a contingency that was not considered by the person who drew up this Bill."

These words would apply exactly to the Bill now before us. The hon. gentleman continued:—

"Now, can it be contended that a motion to attack the principle of the Act is relevant to this Bill?"

Observe that, hon. gentlemen. It is a clear admission that this is a motion to attack the principle of the Act, and not an amendment of any of its little defects. But he continues:—

"I think not; and I think that even if technically it were relevant, the feeling of the House should be at any rate against the motion, coming in as it does now. Every one will admit that no more important amendment, except a motion to repeal the Scott Act—which would be just as much in order—as this, could be moved in relation to this Bill than the one submitted to the House by the hon. member from Amherst."

Surely, if anything can be distinctly stated, we have here a very clear and distinct statement that in the opinion of my hon. friend last year, the introduction of such an amendment as he now proposes was not to amend the Act, not to make it more operative, but entirely destructive of the principle of the Act. A little further on he says:

"The hon. gentleman from Amherst, and those gentlemen who are acting with him now, are very fond of boasting of the manly way in which they like to carry on a fight; and the hon. gentleman himself is very apt to talk about temperance people as being addicted to doing things in a way that is not manly or straightforward. I am not a temperance man, but I should say that those hon. gentlemen in attacking the principle of the Scott Act, under cover of this Bill are not acting consistently with their professions of manliness."

I hope the hon. gentleman will take that to himself. He is now doing this very thing which last year he said was not consistent with the professed principles of manliness. He continues:

"This amendment is certainly an attack on the principles of the Canada Temperance Act, and it is not made in what I regard as a manly or straightforward way. If hon. gentlemen think that the majority of voters required to bring the Act into operation should be larger than it is, the proper way to do would be to introduce a Bill to that effect."

I hope my hon. friend is satisfied that I have at least made good my statement that last year when this very question was before the House, his views coincided with mine as to the impropriety of any such amendment as he now proposes to make to this Bill. I have already said that it is entirely unconstitutional; that it is a principle with which we are not familiar in British practice, that is, giving to the minority the power to control the majority. I am not sure that my hon. friend has thought of the other operation, in cases where the repeal of the Act is to be voted upon—that he has been equally careful in that case to require that a three-fifths vote should be necessary to repeal the Act.

Now, besides my objection to it on constitutional principles, and believing it entirely unnecessary, I might also remark that it is entirely uncalled for. We have had no petitions addressed to this House, because I except those introduced in the Senate since this matter was brought before us, in support of the amendment of the hon. member from Halifax. Without any person asking us throughout the whole length and breadth of the country, we have voluntarily amended this Bill and interfered, as my hon. friend said in his speech last year, with the very principle of the Act, doing the best we can to destroy it. It so happens that a similar amend-

ment was proposed in the House of Commons. It was not precisely the same motion; Mr. Ives' proposition was to require that the Act shall be adopted by an actual majority of the voters on the list—a very similar proposition to that of my hon. friend. What was done there? By a most decisive vote—17 voting for it to 109 against it—the amendment was rejected. You have here a very clear and distinct expression of the view of the House of Commons with respect to this particular point of requiring more than a majority vote to bring the Act in force in any county. While we are not bound to register the acts of the other House, it is certainly due to that body that we should give very full consideration to matters to which they have directed their attention and on which they have recorded their judgment, and we should not take action exactly contrary to that which they have taken, without good reason, and without grave and mature deliberation upon it. I know that when I have made remarks about what has been done in the other House, hon. gentlemen have spoken of the independence of this body, and have asked what is the use of us if we are to accept everything coming from the other House. There is no doubt we are called upon, as an independent body, to exercise our judgment on the legislation coming from the House of Commons, but I still contend in a matter which has been very fully and fairly considered by them and on which they have recorded their decision, that we ought to be exceedingly careful before we take a step in direct contradiction to theirs, and send back to them an amendment on a subject upon which they have already given their decision in the negative. It is a very unwise thing for us to do. There are times when it is our bounden duty—when the very *raison d'etre* of this House requires that we should work as a check upon the legislation of the House of Commons, but only two particular instances occur to me now where such a step becomes necessary. One is in case there should be any move for party purposes by the majority who happen to be in power in the other House. I think the duty of this Chamber would be to exercise its functions to prevent a general wrong being done for party interests, and to check legislation of that character. The other is if any measure were very suddenly sprung upon the House, on which the views of the people were not known, in that case, I think it would be the duty of the Senate, and we would be acting with great propriety, to refuse our sanction to such a measure; but neither of these cases will apply to the present question. We cannot call it a new matter. Here is a measure which has been for several years on the statute book, which has received in a very remarkable way the endorsation or approval of a large number of the electors of this country, and we have had before us no complaint whatever of injustice or wrong doing, or even of any desire for a change such as is now proposed. I do trust that due consideration will be given to these things, and that hon. gentlemen will follow my example, and keep to the text in discussing these motions. I hope the House will not agree to the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Halifax.

The Senate divided on the amendment which was rejected by the following vote:

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Almon,	McMillan,
Campbell, (Sir Alex.),	McInnes,
Carvell,	Montgomery,
Clemow,	Northwood,
Dever,	O'Donohoe,
Glasier,	Ogilvie,
Guévremont,	Plumb,
Hamilton,	Power,
Kaulbach,	Robitaille,
Lacoste,	Smith,
McDonald,	Turner.—23.
McKindsey,	

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Alexander,	Haythorne,
Allan,	Leonard,
Armand,	McKay,
Baillargeon,	Macdonald,
Bellerose,	Miller (Speaker),
Boucherville de,	Paquet,
Chaffers,	Pelletier,
Chapais,	Poirier,
DeBlois,	Scott,
Ferrier,	Stevens,
Flint,	Vidal,
Girard,	Wark,—25.
Grant,	

HON. MR. MCMILLAN moved:—

That the said Bill be not now read a thir time, but that it be referred back to a Com-

mittee of the Whole House, with instructions further to amend the fifth clause by inserting therein immediately after the first amendment thereto already made the following:—

"Provided also that nothing in this Act shall be held to interfere with the sale by legally qualified physicians, chemists or druggists of the following articles, that is to say:—

"1. The officinal preparations of the authorized pharmacopœas when made of full medicinal strength, and sold only for medicinal purposes.

"2. Physicians' prescriptions containing spirituous liquors if sold in quantities of not more than eight ounces at any one time.

"3. Any patent medicine, unless such patent medicine is known to the vendor to be capable of being used as a beverage, the sale of which is a violation of 'The Canada Temperance Act, 1878.'

"4. Eau de colonge, bay rum, or other articles of perfumery, lotions, extracts, varnishes, tinctures, or other pharmaceutical preparations containing alcohol, but not intended for use as beverages.

"5. Alcohol or methylate spirits, for pharmaceutical, chemical or industrial uses."

He said: I wish to make just two alterations in that amendment; one is to add after "interfere with the," the words "purchase or." It would then read, "provided also that nothing in this Act shall be held to interfere with the purchase or sale by legally qualified physicians etc." And at the suggestion of my hon. friend from Belleville, I ask that the word "industrial" in the fifth paragraph be struck out, and that the word "mechanical" be substituted therefor. I do not know that it is necessary for me to add anything to what I said when I introduced the amendment with reference to the medical profession. However I may state that the druggists went a little further than the medical men in order to ascertain the legal construction put upon section 99 of the Canada Temperance Act, and they obtained the opinion of a legal firm of good standing in the city of Toronto, from which I may read the following:—

OPINION OF MESSRS. MOWAT, MACLENNAN, DOWNEY AND BIGGAR ON THE SCOTT ACT.

Our opinion is asked, on behalf of the Ontario College of Pharmacy, upon the following questions arising out of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, commonly known as the Scott Act:

1. To what extent are the rights of druggists to sell liquor under the Pharmacy Act interfered with by the Scott Act?

1. The rights of druggists to sell liquor are interfered with by the Scott Act to the same extent precisely as those of all other persons. The Pharmacy Act does not expressly authorize druggists to sell liquor—as such—and the Temperance Act deals with them in precisely the same way as with others, except that it names druggists as persons who may be specially licensed to sell for lawful purposes intoxicating liquors, subject to the conditions of sub-sections 3 and 4 of section 99, namely: (1) wine for sacramental purposes, on the certificate of a clergyman; (2) intoxicating liquor for exclusively medicinal purposes, such sale to be in quantities of not less than one pint, to be removed from the premises, and to be made only on the certificate of a medical man having no interest in the sale, and affirming that such liquor has been prescribed for the person named therein; (3) intoxicating liquor for bona fide use in some art, trade or manufacture, to be made on a certificate signed by two Justices of the Peace that the application is bona fide, and accompanied by the affirmation of the applicant that the liquor is to be used only for the particular purposes therein set forth; (4) the certificates are to be kept on file, and all sales under the two preceding sub-sections are to be registered, shewing the name of the purchaser and the quantity sold, and an annual return of all such sales is to be made on the 31st of December in each year to the Collector of the Inland Revenue within whose division the county or city is situated.

V. In localities where the Scott Act is in force, may ordinary tinctures and spirituous medicinal compounds be sold by druggists who have not obtained licences under the section 99 of that Act?

V. The Act (section 99) forbids the sale or gift, except under conditions and for the purposes therein prescribed, of "any spiritous or other intoxicating liquor, or any mixed liquor capable of being used as a beverage, or part of which is spirituous or otherwise intoxicating" and, in section 2—"the expression intoxicating liquor means and comprehends any and every spirituous or malt liquor, and every wine and any and every combination of liquors or drinks that is intoxicating."

We are of the opinion that compounds prepared by chemists and druggists are clearly within the Act, and that chemists and druggists are forbidden to expose or keep for sale, or sell, or barter, or in consideration of the purchase of any other property give to any other person any medicinal preparations, whatever, which come within the definition of "spirituous or intoxicating liquor, or mixed liquor capable of being used as a beverage, and part of which is spirituous or otherwise intoxicating." Whether any particular tincture or spirituous medicnal compound comes within this definition is not a question of law, but a matter of fact to be determined in each particular case.

April 9th, 1885.

Having obtained this opinion, the druggists are applying to this House to amend the Canada Temperance Act, so far as their calling is concerned. Of course it does not affect any principle that is contained in the Bill as far as the question of temperance is concerned; it is simply giving to them, an important body numbering over 1200 in the Dominion of Canada, the privilege of carrying on their trade without interference. It was only recently that they discovered the position in which they stood, and they wish to be relieved from any annoyance or from suits which might be entered against them for acting in contravention of the law. They are, as I have said, an important body; a great many of them have a large amount of capital invested in their business. Besides their capital, I may say it is almost a profession which they cannot enter upon without undergoing a long period of training and a critical examination and that is also a part of their capital. Of course if they should be prevented from carrying on their legitimate trade by this Act, which I am sure was not intended by the framers of it, it is a hardship and grievance which no hon. member in this House would like to see them suffer.

HON. MR. SCOTT—When the Temperance Act was up before the House this question was fully considered, and I do not think that the amendment is desirable. I do not think it is wise or proper to—I won't say tinker—I do not think that is a parliamentary word—but to undertake to make an important amendment like this when really no necessity exists for it. The druggists when dispensing the various compounds within their legitimate calling have not been disturbed. No prosecution has been entered against them nor has any complaint been made in the courts against them for selling for the purposes herein disclosed. I will read a sub-section of section 99 of the Canada Temperance Act which covers it. The fourth sub-section is as follows:—

"Provided also that the sale of intoxicating liquor for exclusively medicinal purposes or for bona fide use in some art, trade or manufacture, shall be lawful only by such druggists and other vendors as may be thereto specially licensed."

Now, if it is to be used in any trade, art or manufacture, it is permitted under the statute as it is, and I do not think it is desirable that we should widen the door or point out in what particular way the spirit of the Act can be evaded. There would be no objection to the first and second paragraphs of this amendment, but it is a matter of notoriety that patent medicines are being sold simply as a cover for the sale of alcohol. The Government have been obliged to interdict a number of them in the North-West, where the Act is in force aganist the sale of intoxicating liquors.

I think it has been found on examination that what is called Perry Davis' Pain Killer, as prepared in the North-West, is simply another name for alcohol; and other medicines, the Minister of Justice will probably recollect have been interdicted in the North-West, simply because they were a medium for distributing alcohol. On that ground I do not think it is wise that the House should accept of the propositions of the hon. gentleman. To the first and second one there is no objection; to the third and fourth there are objections; to the fifth proposition there would be no objection. The third and fourth should stand their chances and come under the provisions of sub-section four, and if the alcohol is simply produced in a *bona fide* manner it will be protected, but if bay rum, or any extract or tincture, or any other preparation is simply to be used as a cover for selling alcohol, then it ought not to be permitted, because it is simply a mode of evading the Act. I, therefore, must ask the House not to accept the third and fourth propositions of the hon. member from Glengarry. I would move, therefore, that the amendment be further amended by striking out the sub-sections three and four in the proviso contained in the notice.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment, which was lost on the following division:—

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Allan,	Miller (Speaker),
Boucherville de,	Paquet,
Chaffers,	Pelletier,
Chapais,	Power,
Dever,	Poirier,
Ferrier,	Scott,

Flint,	Stevens,
Girard,	Trudel,
Grant,	Vidal,
Haythorne.	Wark.—21.
Leonard,	

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Alexander,	McMillan,
Almon,	Macdonald,
Baillargeon,	MacInnes,
Campbell (Sir Alex.),	Montgomery,
Carvell,	Northwood,
Clemow,	O'Donohoe,
DeBlois,	Ogilvie,
Goevremont,	Plumb,
Kaulbach,	Robitaille,
Lacoste,	Smith,
McDonald,	Turner.—23.
McKay,	

The amendment was declared carried on a division.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

HON. MR. GIRARD, from the Committee, reported the Bill with the amendment, which was concurred in.

THE SPEAKER—The motion is now on the third reading of the Bill as amended.

HON. MR. NELSON moved,

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to a committee of the Whole House to re-insert the words "except a city" in the tenth line of the second section.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am sorry that the hon. gentleman from New Westminster is not in his place. It struck me when he was arguing the question, that he had the right on his side, because if the words now proposed to be inserted were adopted, the city of New Westminster would be deprived of its vote altogether. The city has no representation in the Commons, and unless it votes as part of the electoral district it will have no vote at all.

HON. MR. NELSON—I beg to say that the amendment which I propose will just put British Columbia in the same predicament as all the other provinces of the Dominion. I hold in my hand the old Act. I will read clause 4 of the Act. It provides that "Any petition to the Governor General in Council for the bringing of the second part of this Act into force in any county or city may be in the form of Schedule A to this Act, or in words to the same effect." In the Bill before us the words, "electoral district" simply take the place of the word "county," and the effect of this amendment will be simply to place British Columbia in the same position as the province of Ontario or any other province. This amendment was made in the House of Commons at the instance of one of the members from the province of British Columbia, who had the support and authority of all the other members from that province, and was carefully looked into before it was adopted.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I think the hon. gentleman is wrong in stating that there is an exact similarity between the electoral division in British Columbia and other provinces of the Dominion. The term "electoral districts" there includes cities within the territorial limits of the electoral district, and if this amendment is accepted, the city will not have the right to vote.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The House will see almost immediately that if the words "except a city" are inserted it will mean that the city of New Westminster is excluded from voting on this Act, because it will be excepted from the electoral division.

HON. MR. NELSON—It will be exactly in the same position as a city in Ontario. There is a provision in the Bill for cities voting, and I will ask the House to divide on my amendment.

HON. MR. POWER—I think that this is a matter of some considerable consequence, and the House ought to be informed before voting, which construction is the correct one. The hon. gentleman from British Columbia says that the effect of his amendment would be to place the cities of Victoria and New Westminster in exactly the same position as the cities in Ontario. If that is the only effect of his amendment, it is a fair and proper one.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It will exclude them from voting.

HON. MR. POWER—If the interpretation of the hon. gentleman from British Columbia is correct, then the vote may be taken in New Westminster itself, or in Victoria itself.

HON. MR PLUMB—It cannot be taken in either alone.

HON. MR. POWER—Are there not cities in Ontario which are not electoral divisions, in which elections are held under the Scott Act?

HON. MR. VIDAL—Yes.

HON. MR. POWER—I think that some gentleman who has a special interest in the Bill ought to inform us from the original Temperance Act what the provisions respecting cities are.

HON. MR. NELSON—I refer the hon. gentleman to clause 4 of the old Act; the word "city" in British Columbia takes the place of the word "county," and I cannot see why a city in British Columbia should be affected differently under this Act from any city in Ontario.

The amendment was declared lost on a division.

THE SPEAKER—The question is now on the third reading.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Moved in amendment that the said bill be not now read the third time, but that it be amended by striking out the section which permits the sale of ale, beer and wine and cider in counties and cities where the second part of the temperance Act of 1878 is in force. He said: I think this is a matter of too great importance to allow it to pass without expressing the views which I entertain on this subject. If I were to occupy the time of the House for a whole hour, I would not be intruding on it, or taking any more time than is rightly my due. In introducing this measure, I merely dealt with the principle of the Bill before us, and so in the discussion which has gone on in committee, I have not followed the example set by other hon. gentlemen, and which has been so abundantly followed by those who have spoken on the question, by discussing the whole principle of temperance legislation. I wish to speak to hon. gentlemen as reasonable men, and on a matter of very great importance, more particularly when I think the House is making a grave mistake in the course it is adopting in relation to this particular Bill. I wish to place before the country the fact that the action, taken by this Senate, is taken intelligently, calmly and deliberately. I wish that every member who votes for or against this measure should be held responsible for it, and I wish, therefore, that the statement shall be put clearly and distinctly before the people of this country, that they may know the grounds on which we claim that the Senate ought not to allow such a clause as this to be attached to this Bill. The first ground we take is that we have before us a very large number of petitions, signed by a vast number of the most influential and respectable people of this Dominion.

HON. MR. ALMON— Hear, hear!

HON. MR. VIDAL—The hon. gentle- says "hear, hear!" but he cannot deny the fact that petitions have been sent in here signed by a large number of the most influential people in this Dominion praying that no amendment be made to the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, which will impair its efficiency or render it more difficult of adoption, or enforcement. Are we entirely to disregard these petitions, representing as they do over 100,000 of our people, and are we to turn a deaf ear to their prayer? I think hon. gentlemen if we do we are going beyond our province when we endeavor to enforce our own private views and feelings on a country that does not approve of them, and is not in accord with the action taken by the Senate on this question. Not only are those numerous petitions respectably signed urging us to take no step that may impair the efficiency of this Act, but we have the indisputable proof that the Act meets with the approval of a large majority of the people in the counties and cities where it has been submitted for their approval.

HON. MR. ALMON—The hon. gentleman must also remember that a large

number of petitions have been presented to Parliament praying that ale, beer and light wines be exempted from the operation of the Scott Act.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I am not to be turned from my purpose by those remarks. These interruptions may gratify the persons making them but they have no effect on my argument, and cannot shake the truthfulness of the statement which I make, and the country even now is responding to it. It is true we have not many petitions presented to this House now, because the impression has gone abroad that we finished our part of the legislation on this Bill after we had adopted this amendment; but petitions are presented in large numbers in the other House, asking them not to concur in the amendment, and setting forth the reasons why it is incumbent on them to refuse their assent to any such destructive proposition. I hold, then, that in addition to those petitions we have the evidence of the votes cast in favor of the Scott Act, that it is one which meets with the approval of a very large number of the people of this Dominion, and in the action we are taking we are doing them a wrong and are really departing from the line of conduct we ought to follow in this House and committing an outrage on those people who, placing their faith on the action of Parliament, have taken a great deal of trouble, expended large sums of money, and have succeeded in having this Act adopted in some 60 municipalities in this Dominion.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Expended large sums of money?

HON. MR. VIDAL—Yes, and the country has also expended large sums of money. Every election has cost the country a large sum of money, and what is it all for? The people have adopted this Act in those municipalities, and are satisfied with it, and this House, in its supposed wisdom, disregards the wishes and prayers of the people, and set aside the claims of these 100,000 petitioners for fair, even-handed justice.

They have been induced to bring this Act into operation, putting their faith in Parliament: and Parliament here, not only unsolicited, but contrary to the express prayer of a large number of petitioners, is taking a step entirely destructive of that Act. What county would ever adopt it with such a clause as that in it? No temperance man would cross the street to vote for such an Act. I say it is a gross injustice to those who, believing in the integrity and honesty of intention of Parliament, have taken the trouble to bring it in force. Then, again, look at the result. I am afraid hon. gentlemen have not thought of this matter, and it is on this ground that I think it may not be entirely without hope to urge on them a reconsideration of this question—what is to be the result of the adoption of this amendment? It is to bring about free trade in liquor in every county where the Scott Act is in force. There is no provision for the restraining or putting any check on the liquor trade, and it will result in free trade in liquor in every county where the Scott Act is in force.

HON. MR. SMITH—Not in spirits.

HON. Mr. VIDAL—The hon. gentleman will admit there is from four to twelve per cent. of spirit in these liquors, but that is not the question. We know very well where these beverages are in use, the right quantity of spirit will be introduced to suit the public taste. It is done now and it is still more likely to be done under the amendment.

HON. MR. SMITH—Where is it done?

HON. MR. VIDAL—All over the country. This is the real state of the case—by passing this amendment to the Act you are virtually giving free trade in liquor in every county where the Scott Act has been adopted. Are you prepared to take this step in the face of all the earnest petitions which have been presented? Are you prepared to take this retrograde action in the face of the decision of the other House on the amendment of Mr. Gigault, which amendment was rejected? It is not an amendment to the Act; it is a completely destructive clause added to the Act—it is even worse than destructive. I would rather see the Act fairly and honestly repealed by a direct vote than by this unfair and unmanly amendment.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Unmanly?

HON. MR. VIDAL—I am speaking of the act, not of the individuals who are responsible for it. I say the amendment is a dishonest and unmanly one, because it is intended to destroy the Bill. I suppose the House will probably affirm its prior action. I should hope that some minds will be open to conviction when they see the evil result of the amendment in the counties where the Act is in force, and that they will withdraw from the position which they have taken and not inflict such a curse on the country. I have already shown the result of laws passed in the Mother Country to encourage the use of light wines and ale. I could, if time permitted, read the evidence taken before committees of the House of Lords and House of Commons in England, where they pronounced the Beer Act, introduced there to accomplish the very purpose for which this amendment is introduced here, to be the greatest curse ever inflicted on the country, showing that it increased crime and pauperism more than anything else that could possibly be conceived. I do not purpose further to trespass on the time of the House, but I wish to place permanently on record the position in which hon. gentlemen stand on this question—I wish the country to see that whatever course they take is taken with their eyes open as to the result which must follow the adoption of this amendment—that it will have the effect of establishing free trade in alcoholic drinks wherever the Scott Act is in force.

HON. MR. ALLAN—If the House will bear with me for a few moments, I should like to explain the reasons why I, who am neither a total abstainer myself, nor a believer in prohibition, yet have voted throughout against every amendment that is offered to this Bill, and what I say I hope will, at all events, justify my course, if not in the eyes of all the members of this House, at least in the eyes of many both inside and outside of the House, and may peradventure have some little weight also with some hon. gentlemen whom I have the honor of addressing. When the Scott Act was first introduced, I voted for some of these very amendments which have been proposed during the present session. I voted for the amendment with regard to the numbers required to carry the petition in the first instance; I voted for the permission to sell light wines, ale and lager beer, and for several other amendments to the Act Those amendments were lost, and the Scott Act became the law of the land. Although I did not believe that it was the best means that could be adopted for bringing about temperance in the country, although I did not believe in making men temperate by Act of Parliament, still I knew that the feeling of a very large number of my fellow subjects, at all events in my own part of the country, in the province of Ontario, was in favor of the Act, and I made up my mind that I would not again vote for any amendment to the Bill, which could, in any way, hamper its working, or against any amendment which might be brought to facilitate the carrying out of its provisions, until it had a fair trial in the country, and for a reasonable length of time. In the first place, if I may be permitted to say so, I think that some deference is due from this House as from the other branch of Parliament, to the opinion of the people of the country. I attach very little importance indeed to the number of the petitions with which this House has been flooded. I know very well how signatures to these petitions are very often obtained; I know the pressure that is brought to bear in communities and in congregations in order to obtain signatures to those petitions and, therefore, I do not attach any great weight to them, though I do not intend to speak for any province outside of my own. I am perfectly aware, and I think I speak with some knowledge of the subject when I say that, attach as little weight as you like to the petitions with which this House has been flooded during the present session, there can be no denying this fact, that there is a very large number of thoughtful people in the province of Ontario who are firmly persuaded that intemperance is a very great evil in the midst of our community, and that some such remedy as the Scott Act is required in order to put an end to it. There is no doubt whatever that some of the most earnest-minded, and thoughtful men in the country representing the different denominations, take that view. The very case

quoted by the hon. member from Sarnia the other day of the representation made by the Synod of the Church of Scotland in Ontario, in reference to temperance legislation, can be quoted as an instance. I can also quote as an instance the part taken by the Church of England in Ontario, the Methodist Church in Ontario—

HON. MR. ALMON—What has been done by the Church of England? What has the Church of England done with regard to this question, because as far as I am aware—and I am an humble member of that denomination—I do not know that the Church of England has interfered in any way whatever with the Scott Act.

HON. MR. ALLAN—I say the Church of England has taken a very active and energetic step in the cause of temperance. I do not pretend to know anything about what the Church of England may have done or may be doing in the hon. gentleman's province, but I say the Church o England in Ontario have taken up this question of temperance very warmly and energetically. I say, also, that a very large number of members of the Church of England are in favor of total prohibition; others, again, are not in favor of it; and in the organization which has been formed in the Church of England, I am very glad to say that it is so formed that I, myself, who am not a prohibitionist and not a total abstainer, can take part in their proceedings equally with those who are total abstainers. We are united in our endeavors to do something towards promoting the cause of temperance in the country, and we are happily able to do this without falling foul of each other and thinking that those whose views are opposed to our own are all wrong. Therefore, I say the point I am endeavoring to make is a perfectly good one, that this question of temperance has occupied the attention of some of the most thoughtful men in the country, men whose opinions are most entitled to weight, and although I do not attach the same importance that the hon. member from Sarnia and his friends do to the petitions which have been sent in here, I do attach very great importance indeed to the expressions of opinion which have come from representative bodies like those to which I have alluded. I have no doubt whatever, in my own mind, that very much injury has been done to the cause of temperance by the "intemperance" of those who have advocated it. There is no doubt whatever, that the course which has been pursued by some of the most earnest advocates of temperance, who would set down everyone who is not a prohibitionist and total abstainer as "a heathen man and a publican," is not the course best calculated to advance the cause they have at heart, but because the total abstainers are so extreme in their language towards those who do not agree with them, that should not blind us to the magnitude of the evil which exists throughout our country. It is all very well to say that in Canada we are, as compared with other countries, a very temperate people. I am very glad and very thankful that this can be said to any extent to be the case, but no man can go throughout this country, observant of what is going on around him, and taking an interest in the welfare of the people—no one especially can be mixed up in any way in our cities or towns with different societies and organizations for the relief of the distressed and the poor—without having forced upon him beyond any sort of contradiction the enormous amount of misery, crime and wretchedness which flows from that one source — intemperance — and therefore, I feel I am not justified as a Christian man in offering obstructions to any thing which may possibly offer any remedy for this great evil which I know does exist. That is one great reason why I, though not believing in prohibition as the best mode of remedying this great evil—not believing the Scott Act is going to do all that its promoters believe it will—am not willing to take the responsibility of throwing anything in the way of the successful operation of that Act until there has been a reasonable time to show whether it can effect the objects that Parliament had in view in passing it. There is no question about it that very much injury is done to the cause of temperance by the extravagance of those who advocate it. Allusion was made to the county of Simcoe in the course of the debate this afternoon. I happen to know something of the county of Simcoe. I have property there, and I

am there for a very considerable part of the time. It was only last year that in one small town in that county I saw no less than four taverns, almost at the four corners of the principal street, and round every one of these taverns in the middle of the day there were young men loafing about who had been in for their mid-day drink. I am only giving this as the result of my observation in a single instance in passing through the country, but I know that this sort of thing prevails in many other places, and although I think the effect of the extravagant language which has been used by the advocates of temperance has often been to tempt those who do not agree with them to throw ridicule on the movement, to sneer at and make light of it, yet, hon. gentlemen, I put it to you whether we should lose sight of the fact that intemperance in itself is a wrong, a sin, and a crime, one which brings other wrongs, sins and crimes in its train. Those who are fortunate enough not to have it come home to them in their own personal experience, do not often feel or think of it seriously enough, but ask the opinion of those into whose families the curse has crept, and hear what they say; and when we know that that has been the experience unfortunately of hundreds in our community we cannot wonder that they are so warmly in earnest in seeking a remedy which will put an end to an evil of so fearful a kind. Another reason which moves me for the present, at all events, not to throw any obstacle in the way of the working of the Act is this: there are hundreds of people who will go through the world without straying to the right hand or to the left—upright, respectable members of society—so long as no temptations are put within their reach. Put them within the reach of temptation and then the mischief comes. Now, that was exactly the state of the case in many of the small towns and villages in Ontario before the passing of the Scott Act and its adoption in some of our counties, and it is still the case in our large towns and cities. I say so advisedly because I know it and have seen it. There are hundreds of men who will go through life perfectly upright honest citizens so long as they are not put within the reach of temptation, but when the temptation comes they fall and when, as is the case in so many of our towns now that the laboring man and the mechanic cannot go home from his work if he has half a dozen streets to pass through on his way, without encountering at every other corner a tavern or a saloon where he is tempted to enter and take a glass of liquor before he reaches his home—so long as such temptations exist and are thrown in the way of those who cannot resist them, so long shall we have intemperance prevailing with all its attendant miseries. But while I say all this, I am perfectly free to admit that I do not think the Scott Act, whatever it will do in the country (and I am not at all persuaded that there it will be in a great measure a success) will succeed in towns—while I am perfectly persuaded of that and while I do not think that the working of the Act will turn out to be satisfactory yet I am most anxious that those who think that it will, shall have the opportunity of having it fairly tried, and let me assure this House, notwithstanding all that has been said, that they form a very large proportion of those whose opinions are most worthy of attention in the province of Ontario, at all events. I do not speak for any part of the country outside Ontario, but the sympathies of a very large proportion of earnest thinking men will go in a great measure with this Act, and therefore, I desire to see that it has a full and fair trial. If it breaks down, then it will be time enough for us to see what other legislation may be adopted. I am perfectly aware the Act will inflict in many places—I do not think it is putting it too strongly—very serious injury and loss upon some individuals. There is no doubt about it, there are many men who have invested their money in breweries for instance—I cannot say I have much sympathy for the whiskey distillers—who will suffer almost ruin, but bad as that is, I do not think it is to be a reason for setting aside the Act if it will do all that which its promoters are confident it will do—that is, to put down intemperance throughout the country, because that is an object which it is well worth making many sacrifices to secure. I perfectly agree with what has fallen from the hon. member from Belleville to-night, that what we have to look at is not merely the question of pounds, shillings and pence, but if the liquor traffic brings ruin on the souls of hundreds, it is a question which this House

ought certainly not to treat lightly ; it is a question which ought to be approached gravely and ought not to be put aside with a sneer or a jest. While I again repeat, then, what I said on the first day that this Bill was brought into this House, and when I myself was one of those who voted for amendments to it similar to those now before the House—while I still say I do not think the Bill is calculated to do all that its promoters think it will do, yet I am prepared to vote for it. I am prepared to give its promoters every facility for making the Temperance Act more easily and thoroughly worked until it shall be proved by time and experience that it is a failure.

HON. MR. CARVELL—The hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Allan) has told us that he will speak only for his own province, and for the most part the very few remarks I have to make will relate to the operation, or rather the inoperation, of the Scott Act in the province from which I come. A good deal has been said on this question since the debate began, the greater part of which I did not hear because of my inability to be present, but I have heard enough of it to satisfy me that there are other forms of intemperance besides those arising from the use of intoxicating drinks ; and while the hon. members from Sarnia and Trent division assert that those who are opposed to their views on this question are intemperate in their language and wander from the point, I can only say that we have had no monopoly of that sort of thing. They, at least, have an equal share with us. This question strikes me as being divided into two principal divisions—one, the right or expediency of legislation on the subject, how far Parliament has a right to deal with it, how far any class of people in the country, be they ever so numerous, have a right to say what their neighbors shall eat or drink, or wherewithal they shall be clothed. That side of the question has been dealt with by many hon. gentlemen who are better able to discuss it than I am myself, but I think it will not be out of order if I especially allude to the able speech made by the hon. the senior member from Halifax this afternoon. I think he treated that question very ably and very moderately. I will deal with the other great division, the expediency of the Scott Act. I claim that the Scott Act has failed entirely in the object sought by its friends. The question of temperance or intemperance, of men getting drunk and being beggared and going to the lower regions in consequence of being drunk, has nothing more to do with this Act, as I view it, than has the question of the incorporation of a railway company. The question is, as I say in this second division of it, as to the expediency or utility of it. I say it has been not only an entire failure, but worse than a failure, giving rise to evils that are worse even than those existing in our country because of its intemperance. In speaking on this question two years ago, I spoke of our own province. I happen to have dropped across an official statement as to the working of the Act in Prince Edward Island, and I stand here now prepared to prove that not only has it not aided the temperance cause, but that intemperance is greater to-day than it was when the Act was first brought into force in the province of Prince Edward Island, that drunkenness is greater, that the temperance wave which was sweeping over our fair province then has been stopped and the reverse has followed. Our province has been spoken of by my hon. friend from Sarnia as the banner province—as the one which was the first to adopt the Scott Act, and the first to re-enact it. We have had the Scott Act in force throughout the island now for three years. In Charlottetown, where I live, the Scott Act was re-enacted in August last. As to the result of its operation of three years we have an official statement, the report of the stipendiary magistrate for the year past. With the permission of hon. gentlemen I will read from that statement. The report gives all sorts of breaches of the law, headed by drunkenness, for the space of eight years, 1877 to 1884 inclusive. The figures are as follows :—

1878	729
1879	357
1880	231
1881	256

The first seven months of 1881 there was no Scott Act : the last five months of that year the Scott Act was in force. The two whole years under the Scott Act give these results.

1882.....218
1883.....250

Take the two whole years previous to 1882 and 1883, that is 1879 and 1880, and it will be seen that the number of cases of drunkenness were almost equal. Hon. gentlemen will see that a worse condition, so far as the statement goes, prevailed in 1877. At that time, as I stated on a former occasion, there was good cause for the temperance movement. It was started, headed by the venerable and estimable Bishop of the Diocese, with a number of his clergy and other clergymen throughout the city, county and island. The result of that movement was, as hon. gentlemen will see, to reduce drunkenness more than one-half. It fell from 729 in 1877 to 357 in 1878. The next year there was a still further reduction to 231, and then it goes on pretty regularly. Making a comparison between the two years 1879 and 1880, when there was no Scott Act, and 1882 and 1883, when there was a Scott Act, the temperance wave was stopped; and when I tell hon. gentlemen that for the two years under the Scott Act the arrests were made by a police force of only six, while the equal number of arrests made in 1879 and 1880 were made by a police force of nineteen, they will readily see that there was an increase in the number of cases of drunkenness, because 19 policemen would arrest a greater number of drunkards than six policemen would; and I know from my own observation that on the street drunken men passing on without arrest were more numerous than I ever saw them before—that is within the six years—so I think these figures clearly demonstrate not only that the Scott Act has not stemmed the tide of intemperance but, on the contrary, has increased it; because, as I say, if the same number only are picked up under the Scott Act by six policemen, as compared with 19 policemen in the former years, it shows that at least twice as much drunkenness prevails. Leaving Charlottetown we go to the eastern county, and we find last year a state of things in the county town there that has not been equalled within my recollection, which goes back 25 years—so much drunkenness has not prevailed during court week in that place. The streets were taken charge of for days. Going west, to the banner county of Prince, there has been a great deal of drunkenness there all the time—there has been no decrease of it. Only the other day a gentleman engaged in the tanning business in the western part of the island told me that they had never been so troubled with drunkenness as last year in all the years that they have been in business. So, if the Scott Act not only fails to stem the tide of intemperance but allows it to increase, it is a failure; and when we add to this the habitual violation of the law, the many cases of perjury that arise from it, the introduction of worse stuff to drink than there ever was before with a dozen other evils following in its trail, the reasons for its repeal are, to my mind, clear and sufficient. I am not fond of speaking on this or any other subject, and it is almost dangerous to speak on this one. There was an amendment proposed two years ago similar to the one that is now before us, and I ventured then to say something on the subject. A correspondent writing from Prince Edward Island up to the province of Ontario, some twelve hundred miles from where I live, attacked the Senators from Prince Edward Island generally, saying in his letter that if the readers of the paper to which he wrote knew anything of the habits of the Senators from Prince Edward Island, very little importance would be attached to anything they might say in reference to the subject. Again, with reference to myself, he said it was well known that being largely engaged in the West India trade, I would feel the pinch of the shoe. The writer of that letter either knew what he was writing about or he did not. If he knew that I was not in the trade, further than importing sugar and molasses, he wrote a deliberate falsehood; if he did not know it he was equally guilty. It is only another proof that a man may be a malicious slanderer even though he writes the word "Reverend" before his name. I do not wish to say anything more on this subject further than to add that I know whereof I speak; my own observations are sufficient to satisfy me, and I hope the statistics which I have given will be sufficient to satisfy the House. I shall certainly vote for the Bill as it has been already amended.

HON. MR. O'DONOHOE—Listening to this debate, there are two aspects in which it appears to me; one is the coercive character of the Scott Act, and the other the question of temperance. To me, the coercive character of the Act is extremely objectionable. Much has been said of it by the different speakers, and I feel that with the views which present themselves to my mind, I would be scarcely doing justice to myself if I failed to express my opinion upon that character of the Act and upon the general question. I hold it would be entirely wrong that there should be any enactment of Parliament by any number of the people coercing any other number of the people to do this or to do that out of the natural order. I believe if you allow enactments of the character of the Scott Act to be placed on the statute book, that no one can tell where the liberty or the rights of the subject shall end. If to-day they can say "you must not drink," to-morrow they may say "you must not eat;" or they may say to you to-morrow what you shall eat or what you shall drink, or what you shall not eat, or what you shall not drink. That I hold to be thoroughly wrong, and to be a proceeding that this House should not countenance, and when this measure is before this House, it does seem to me to be our duty to eliminate from it its objectionable features. I hold that it is wrong, the Act itself; that it is crude as to the question of temperance. What does it say, and what are its provisions? One of the leading provisions of the Act is that you cannot purchase less than ten gallons of whiskey to commence your career of temperance. I have been told by some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken here to-night, that beer contains 4 per cent. of alcohol, and that wines may have more than 12 per cent.; but no hon. gentleman has ventured to say what percentage of alcohol there is in whiskey, with which you can supply the people to the extent of ten gallons each, under this Act.

HON. MR. McMILLAN—45 per cent.

HON. MR. O'DONOHOE—45 per cent. of alcohol, the temperance men permit you to buy, but 4 per cent. they forbid you from having. Is that temperance? To my mind, it is the strangest method of producing temperance in a community, that ever was enacted or thought of. The man who might buy a gallon of liquor instead of ten gallons, is prohibited from doing it. He who might be able to buy any quantity under 10 gallons, is prohibited; but the man who has the means, and requires it, is enabled to purchase ten gallons and take it home to his family and friends. Is that temperance? It is the most novel kind of temperance that has ever been known, or in regard to which any act has ever been passed. I cannot conceive that to be temperance. I cannot conceive that, because a man is able to buy ten gallons he is permitted to buy it and take it home with him and invite his neighbors and have a good time with it, while he is not permitted to purchase less than ten gallons, it is promoting the cause of temperance. The Act reduces the quantity of beer that may be sold to eight gallons, but you can buy nothing less than eight gallons under the Scott Act. Why make the quantity of beer less than the quantity of whiskey? I have never heard any reason for that. Eight gallons of beer does not contain as much alcohol as one gallon of whiskey, and why reduce the quantity of beer? I dare say that fifty gallons of beer would not have as much alcohol as ten gallons of of whiskey, and yet we are denied the beer on which drunkenness is rare, and allowed whiskey, on which drunkenness is common. They allow whiskey which creates drunkenness, which fills the asylums, and prisons, and police courts, makes families miserable, and brings ruin to the masses; they deny beer, in which there is only four or five per cent. of alcohol, of which everyone in the family can partake without drunkenness, without madness, without frenzy. If a man is drunk on beer he does not become wild or insane. What kind of drunkenness is it that is produced by using too much beer? It is a kind of somnolent drunkenness; it produces sleep, and makes the drinker harmless. Some of those very energetic advocates of temperance tell us that beer is of no value but for the alcohol that is in it, and if you take the 4 or 5 per cent. of alcohol out of it, the rest would be dirty water, and it would not be used at all. It

would be perfectly harmless as a drink; still the temperance people insist that instead of 4 per cent. of alcohol, or the liquor containing 4 per cent., and that would make a man sleepy and harmless, he must take the liquor that would make him mad. That is the advocacy of temperance, as I hear it. I was very much pleased to hear the reasonable and calm manner in which the subject was introduced by the hon. gentleman from York. If the advocates of temperance in this House and elsewhere could only reason it in a like strain, their advocacy would certainly have more attraction for, and greater affect on, the minds of reasoning men; but, on the contrary, men who reason with temperance advocates on the subject are called hard and harsh names. Why have our temperance friends not the common sense to feel that those who differ from them on this important question have honest convictions as well as themselves? We who are here to-day speaking of introducing light wines and beer as a beverage, hold, and believe sincerely, that these are more temperate beverages than whiskey in any quantity beyond ten gallons, and if we do, why should we be called unreasonable for advocating that view of it? Surely, we ought to get credit for sincerity, as well as the advocates of temperance who hope to be looked upon as being sincere. That is the view with which, in my humble judgment, questions of this sort should be presented to this House. If the views expressed by hon. gentlemen here are their honest convictions, and they are expressed in the public interest, they should get credit for sincerity, no matter from which side they come. By this Bill, the German would be deprived of his glass of lager. I for one would not deprive him of it. On the other side of the line, and in parts of western Canada, we see the thrifty and industrious head of a family with his wife and children on a Sunday afternoon, or a Saturday evening, enjoying himself in the beer gardens over his glass of lager, happy and contented, and going home quietly and happily, to work harder the coming week, in the hope that the same day of mirth and relaxation will recur on the coming Sunday. Ought we to take that pleasure away from that German family who have been accustomed to this enjoyment all their lifetime? Ought I to assist, because I have my own peculiar views, in depriving that man and his family of this harmless recreation—a man not known to the courts or to the police, a hard-working man in the field and in the factory, deprive him of that beverage to which he is accustomed—his glass of lager and his pritzel, and other comforts that make him happy and contented? I think it is only unreasonable legislation that would deprive him of it. If I or my family wish for a glass of beer or wine at our table, should any set of men ask for an Act of Parliament to deprive me of that luxury? Should the man who cultivates his vines in western Canada, and manufactures his grapes into light wines, be prevented from using the wine of his vineyard? Should I interfere with those who buy his wine? God forbid that I should, or that I should record my vote in favor of an Act of Parliament that would deprive him of the right to do it. Some of my hon. friends spoke of the injury that this Act might be to certain interests. That is a point worth considering. Should we, by Act of Parliament, take away the property of men who have invested their all in it—men who have planted those vineyards, and who have built those breweries? If the public want them, is it not easier and more just that the people at large should put their hands in their pockets and contribute to pay for the brewery or for the vineyards than that we should make the whole loss fall upon the man who created it, and who was justified in creating it, and who has had the law on his side in creating it? If the public want land for a railway, do they take it from the farmer without compensation? Not at all; the first thing that is done is to measure the land that the company is entitled to take, but they are bound to pay for it. What difference is there in value between that land, and the brewery and its attachments? The public want the one, the public want the other. If the public want my brewery that has cost me $100,000, it is much easier for 4,000,000 of people, if they want it in the interests of the public, to put their hands in their pockets and pay for it than to make me, as an individual, lose the all that I have invested in it, invested under a license, and under the law, as I had a perfect right to do. It is not only the brewer

that this Act affects, putting aside for the moment altogether its coercive character, but it interferes with almost every order of business. You find the bankers petitioning against it. They have notes from people who have invested their all in these establishments. The breweries have in connection with them the coopers who make the barrels; the men who produce the staves; the saw-mill that cuts the wood—they have the whole system of business in connection with those institutions. Shall we throw all those out of business? Shall we disturb the business of the country to such an extent under this Act? No, this Act will do no good; what will do good, and what have been doing good are these: the platform, the press and the pulpit—these are the proper and natural means to bring men to temperance. They have done it. Canada is to-day first of all the lands in the world in point of temperance. The people of Canada are to-day the most temperate people on the earth. It may not have been so 25 years ago. What has produced the change?—the instruments to which I refer, the press, the pulpit and the platform. Send men forward in their benevolence to speak to their fellow men of the danger of intemperance; let them address them in their common humanity; let them address them in their affliction, and in love convert them from intemperance to temperance, and then, and not till then, will you have a wave of temperance principles overspread the land as it should do, not producing an election in this county and in that, but universal temperance. What an anomoly it is, having an election to-day in one county which adopts the Act, while the adjoining county rejects it! In such cases you have temperance in one and intemperance in the other. What sort of system is that checkered system that enforces temperance upon an unwilling people? You are drawing people to the polls, because temperance advocates tell us that they spend lots of money. Men who band themselves together in that way and spend money will bring people to the polls, whereas the masses of the people in those counties are quite indifferent; but by those means the Act is brought into operation in some municipalities, and the result is we find, in the few counties in which the Act is in force, that more liquor is sold and consumed than there was under the license system. We find from the returns presented to Parliament that there has been more liquor sold in the county of Halton since the adoption of the Scott Act than there was before. We find that large quantities of liquor were sold there in the name of medicine, and in every possible illicit way liquor has been sold to the people, and the revenue has been cheated. No money was received for license or revenue, but liquors were sold, liquors of the worst kind, and in all kinds of places. You make smugglers by this Act; you establish espionage by this Act; you make pimps and spies by this Act; you make men go into court and commit perjury to save themselves from the gaol and ruin. Let us substitute for the ten gallons of whiskey, eight gallons of beer; let us have the courage of our convictions; we are here to-day to do our duty as men. Our duty is to give to the people sound light wines, and wholesome beer, and when we have given these and the wine that we produce in our own country, we will put them under proper examination and under proper surveillance by the Government, and we will let no wine or beer be sold that is not up to the standard, and is not a sound and wholesome beverage. I give great credit, and shall always give credit, for much of the work that has been accomplished by temperance men, but when they speak of us who oppose their Act as being intemperate, I take issue with them. Who are the temperate men? I say that those who support the introduction of ale and light wines and prohibit whiskey are the real temperance advocates—men who will not forbid the use of what is reasonable. I appreciate very highly what the member from Toronto said when he spoke of the intemperance of temperance men. Who are they who are not in favor of temperance? Are there any men worth knowing in the Dominion who are not in favor of temperance? What matters it if a man is a moderate drinker himself, at home or elsewhere, as long as he does not abuse his liberty to use liquor? What business has he to drag in his own habits of life into this Chamber? We are discussing this question from a public point of view, and, therefore, what we are urging to-night is,

the substitution of ale and light wines for whiskey as a beverage, that the people will find more healthful, that the advocate of temperance can recommend on the platform, and tell their hearers that they can take it to their homes; that there is no madness in it, and they will bring about a more satisfactory state of things than now exists. These frauds on the revenue by smuggling, the system of espionage and pimping will be banished, and temperance principles will prevail. Temperance men, I admit, have done a great deal, but temperance men belong to no side in politics. They belong to all sides. We find every church engaged in the good work. We have found gentlemen, in debating this question, citing the opinions of learned men, theologians of great experience, and men who have travelled through the world and have observed the habits of the people of other countries. The opinions of those excellent men and high authorities are against the Scott Act. I, therefore, produce none of those authorities. They have been well cited by the senior member from Halifax. I would take it to be a misuse of the time of the House to repeat those authorities. They are reported, and will appear in the Senate Debates, where the public will have an opportunity to read them, and I consider that better than to repeat what has been so well said by others before me. There is one authority, however, to which I would refer on that point. It is an editorial article published in the *Week* of the 21st inst:—

"It cannot be too often repeated that the question is not whether drunkenness is sinful and ruinous, which nobody doubts, nor whether wine is wholesome, but whether coercive legislation is wise and just? If, indeed, wine or beer were literally poison, it would be necessary and right to suppress the sale. But who believes that wine or beer is literally poison, either to body or to mind? Certainly not Canon Farrar, since he admits that they are drunk by millions who not only continue alive, but remain wise and virtuous. Whole nations drink the so-called poison daily without feeling themselves the worse for it. Regular wine drinkers often live to patriarchal ages. We could ourselves mention some who have reached their hundredth year. Cornaro, the famous dietist and centenarian, drank the light wine of his country. Mr. Gladstone is an illustrious proof of the truth of the opinion prononnced the other day by Dr. Andrew Clark, that a glass of wine at the principal meal hurts no man in body, mind or spirit. The man who governs England and leads the House of Commons at seventy-six with unimpaired—it might almost seem with ever-increasing vigor—drinks wine as is well known, every day with his dinner; and as we may venture to say that he has never been guilty of excess in his life, he is also a disproof of the preposterous assertion that temperate use must lead to abuse. The finger of reprobation is always pointed by prohibitionists at England, as the great beer-drinking country; but, if beer is the beverage of a nation which in almost every line of greatness leads the world, it seems to follow, however, scandalous to the prohibitionist the inference may be, that there is no great harm in drinking beer. The English navvy, who always drinks beer, can do a harder day's work than any other man in the world. What people really mean when they say that wine or beer is poison, is only that, in their judgment, it is unwholesome, just as in the opinion of many are tobacco, green tea and pastry. They speak, in short, figuratively, and penal legislation cannot be based on figures of speech. After all, ought we not, in this as in other questions of diet, to make allowance for difference of climate, individual temperament and occupation? The preachers and the ladies who are the most earnest workers in favor of prohibition, being sedantary in their habits and not using much bodily exertion, are naturally drinkers of tea. Is not the navvy, the miner or the stevedore just as naturally a drinker of beer?"

With these observations, which I make in all candor to this House, while the Scott Act has had a trial of eight years, I trust that the same generous trial which was given to it will be extended to the amendment proposed by this House to-night. I hope hon. gentlemen will see the prudence of giving the amendment the same trial as the Scott Act has had, and if in the course of some years it is found that better can be done, and that an improvement is not made, this House will not be tied to the opinions of to-day, but can take up the question again and do the best for the public that can be done.

HON. MR. SCOTT—As there are several gentlemen who desire to take part in this debate, myself amongst the number, I move that the debate be adjourned until to-morrow.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The House will understand that this matter has been postponed day after day on the application of the hon. gentleman who now moves for this adjournment. He has ab-

sented himself from the House on several occasions when the question might have been taken up and settled, and I do not think it comes with good grace from him now that the debate should be adjourned. The House has been sitting from the early afternoon until half-past ten o'clock discussing this question, and I think it is trifling with the House that the vote should not now be taken. There are no new arguments to be brought forward. My hon. friend knows that there is nothing to be said that will be particularly interesting to anybody—in fact, we have been told that it is of the greatest importance that this Bill should not be delayed, in the interests of temperance. Several days ago, there was a desire shown that the House should be forced to take the final stage on this Bill before the recess.

HON. MR. MCINNES—That was before the Bill was mutilated.

HON. MR. WARK—I think it comes with equally bad grace from the hon. member from Niagara to oppose the adjournment of the debate, because he addressed the House himself at great length, and he now wishes to deprive those who have not had that opportunity of the same privilege he exercised himself.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I have not taken any part in the debate on those amendments at all.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think if there are gentlemen here who want to speak on this subject and cannot do so this evening, the debate should be adjourned to allow them an opportunity to speak. Although I am in favor of the amendment, and opposed to this Act totally, I am in favor of adjourning the debate to give all who wish to take part n it an opportunity of expressing their views.

HON. MR. MCINNES—I was very much surprised, indeed, when six o'clock arrived that the request that the debate should be adjourned was not complied with. It is true that the plea was raised that a number of gentlemen wished to go home. That may be very well for hon. gentlemen who live within a few hundred miles of Ottawa, and who can take a run home occasionally and come back again when any question in which they are deeply interested comes before the House; but other gentlemen who have not had an opportunity of seeing their homes or their families for four months, feel that it is a hardship, after being idle for a period of two weeks, to be compelled to come up here this evening to continue this debate when there is really no business of any consequence before the House to prevent this matter being debated to-morrow or next day. If we were pressed for time to dispose of the business before us, I could then see some good reason why this debate should be brought to a close. I have not said anything on this subject, and it was not my intention to do so until within the last 48 hours when I saw the course that affairs were taking, and the extraordinary way in which this question is being dealt with, and I now feel it my duty not to give a silent vote on it. The amendment before the House was proposed by the hon. member from Halifax, and I was inclined to support it in the first place, but after the other extraordinary amendment which will entirely destroy the usefulness of the Scott Act, and do more to retard temperance principles than anything I know of—that is, the exemption of light wines, ale and lager beer from the operation of the Act—I shall certainly be compelled to vote aginst that amendment.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—There are many gentleman who wish to express their opinions on this subject, and as it will take some time to do so it will be inconvenient to keep the House sitting until midnight when we will have very little to do to morrow.

The House divided on the motion to adjourn the debate, which was carried on the following division.

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Alexander,	Haythorne,
Allan,	Kaulbach,
Armand,	Leonard,
Baillargeon,	McInnes,
Bolduc,	Miller (Speaker),

Boucherville de	Paquet,
Chaffers,	Pelletier,
Chapais,	Poirier,
DeBlois,	Power,
Ferrier,	Scott,
Flint,	Stevens,
Girard,	Vidal,
Grant,	Wark.—26.

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Almon,	Macdonald,
Campbell (Sir Alex.),	MacInnes,
Carvell,	Montgomery,
Clemow,	Nelson,
Glasier,	Northwood,
Hamilton,	O'Donohoe,
Lacoste,	Ogilvie,
McDonald,	Plumb,
McKay,	Robitaille,
McKindsey,	Smith,
McMillan,	Turner.—22.

HON. MR PLUMB called the attention of the Speaker to the fact that the hon. member from Quinte had not voted.

HON. MR READ—I have paired.

CANNED GOODS BILL.

THIRD READING POSTPONED.

The order of the day being read for third reading of the Bill intituled "An Act respecting Canned Goods," as amended,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the third clause of the Bill be struck out.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I now move to strike from the 5th clause, which will now be the 4th clause, the word "original."

The motion was agreed to.

THE SPEAKER—The motion is now on the 3rd reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. CARVELL—I received a communication this afternoon from a gentleman who is largely interested in the canned goods trade, and I would ask the Minister of Justice to allow the 3rd reading of the Bill to stand until to-morrow.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have no objection to allow the 3rd reading to stand over.

The order of the day was discharged, and it was ordered that the Bill be read the 3rd time to-morrow.

LONDON LIFE INSURANCE CO'S. BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. MR. PLUMB moved the second reading of Bill (76), "An Act to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company." He said: There are several sections in this Bill that will probably require the attention of the committee. I hardly care just now to take up the time of the House by referring at length to the different features of the Bill, but I think they are all in the direction of proper legislation, and I would ask that the Bill be read the second time and referred to the committee.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

The Senate adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Wednesday, May 27th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AND LIQUOR LICENSE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

DECLARATION PRESENTED.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Before the petitions are read, I desire to bring to the notice of the House the fact that a declaration, under the statute, has been placed in my hand, made by Alexander Macdougald, of Greenfield, township of Kenyon, Glengarry, in which he states that his name is attached to the petition praying that certain changes be made to

the Canada Temperance Act, and that it is there without his authority; that he did not give any authority to attach his name, nor did he put it there. I have examined the petition, and I find the name A. Macdougall, Greenfield, therein. The declaration is as follows:—

CANADA:
Province of Ontario, } I, ALEXANDER McDOUGALL, of Green-
County of Glengarry. } field, in the township of Kenyon, in the county of Glengarry, Postmaster, do solemnly declare—

1. That I am informed that a petition, signed, or purporting to be signed, by about 600 of the inhabitants of the county of Glengarry, has been lately presented to the Senate of Canada by Hon. D. McMillan, praying that the Canada Temperance Act might be amended so as to exempt ale, porter, lager beer, light wine and cider from the operation of the Act, and that, hereafter, three-fifths of the votes passed in any county must be in favor of the Act before it is adopted in such county.

2, That I am informed, among other names, appears the name of A. Macdougall, Greenfield.

3. That I am the only person of that name residing at Greenfield in said county.

4. That I have not signed said petition.

5. That if my name appears on said petition as aforesaid, it must have been signed by some other person without my knowledge or authority, and is therefore a forgery.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously, believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Act passed in the 37th year of Her Majesty's reign, entitled "An Act for the Suppression of Voluntary and Extra-judicial oaths."

A. McDOUGALD.

Declared before me at Township of Kenyon in the County of Glengarry, this 26th day of May, A.D. 1885.

JAMES FRASER, J.P.,
A Justice of the Peace in and for the County of Glengarry.

I desire to lay this on the table.

THE SPEAKER—Perhaps it would be as well to have the matter stand over for a day or two.

HON. MR. McMILLAN—I presented the petition to this House. Of course, I know nothing about whether Mr. McDougall signed the petition, or whether he authorized any one else to sign it on his behalf or not. However, Mr. McDougall does not say in that declaration that he is the only man of the name at Greenfield.

HON. MR. SCOTT—He does.

HON. MR. McMILLAN—He does not say that he is the only McDougall residing in Greenfield, but that Greenfield is his post office.

HON. MR. SCOTT—He says "That I am the only person of that name residing at Greenfield in said county."

HON. MR. McMILLAN—The hon. gentleman must remember that there are a great many McDougalls in the county of Glengarry. There are a great many McDougalls in the township of Kenyon, and I have no doubt there are a great many McDougalls whose post office is Greenfield. I am not going to say whether this McDougall signed that petition, but I will go a little further and say if I had been seeking names to that petition I would not have asked him, because I would be perfectly satisfied that McDougall would not sign an Anti-Scott Act petition, although he would not be willing to sign a petition favoring temperance, yet he would be willing to sign the Scott Act petition; that is his character.

HON. MR. SCOTT—There is no imputation or any question respecting the hon. gentleman who presented the petition.

HON. MR. McMILLAN—No, but it is going a little out of the way to get up a declaration of that kind. I know in a great many instances the petitions that were sent in here in favor of the Scott Act were signed by two or three individuals, whereas there were two or three hundred names to some of them.

HON. MR. ALMON—Would it not be well to appoint a committee to look over the petitions for or against the Scott Act, to inquire into the genuineness of the signatures?

The matter then dropped.

CANNED GOODS BILL.

THIRD READING POSTPONED.

The order of the day having been called for the third reading of Bill (U), "An Act respecting Canned Goods,"

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: The hon. gentleman from Charlottetown asked me to postpone the third reading of this Bill until this afternoon.

HON. MR. CARVELL—From the time I made the request until now, I have not had any opportunity to look at the Bill at all, and I do not know whether I am justified in asking the House to postpone the third reading until to-morrow.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have no objection to postponing it until to-morrow. I move that the order of the day be discharged.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was ordered for the third reading to-morrow.

CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

DROPPED.

The order of the day being read, the House again in Committee of the Whole on Bill (Q), "An Act further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act 1879,"

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: I propose, with the consent of the Minister of Railways, to drop this measure, and I move, therefore, that the order of the day be discharged.

The motion was agreed to, and the order of the day was discharged.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AND LIQUOR LICENSE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

DEBATE CONCLUDED.

The order of the day being read for resuming debate on the Hon. Mr. Vidal's motion, viz.:—

That (Bill 92), The Canada Temperance Act, 1878, and The Liquor License Act, 1883, further amendment Bill (as amended) be not now read a third time, but that it be amended by striking out clause B, which permits the sale of ale, beer and wine in counties and cities where the second part of The Canada Temperance Act, 1878, is in force.

HON. MR. SCOTT said: It was because I felt that the subject was worthy of grave consideration and ought to be approached very thoughtfully, that I had to ask the Senate not to vote on the question last evening, believing that by giving it consideration even for another 24 hours, some of us might think it wise and prudent not to act in a way that in my judgment would be inexpedient. The subject is one I think of sufficient importance to warrant a much longer debate than we have already had upon it. I think it is due to that very considerable number of the people of this country who have, in the last two or three years, adopted the Temperance Act of 1878, that they should not be defrauded of the right that they believed they had acquired under the Act of Parliament. The people chiefly interested in the advocacy of the measure of 1878 had asked for a very much broader one, but Parliament declined; Parliament said the people are not all equally educated in the various parts of this country on this question of temperance, but wherever there is a popular vote in any locality we will give it to them, and we do so under what is known as the local option law. The law was challenged at the outset. It received all the opposition that a Bill of that sort could meet with from those interested in defeating it, and hon. gentlemen are not quite correct in saying that this Act has had eight years' trial. It has not had three years' trial. It has scarcely had one year's trial, because it was only in the year 1882 that it was finaliy decided by the highest tribunal in the land that this Parliament had power to enact that law. Before that, convictions under the Act were perfectly futile; it was left until the case of Russell and the Queen would be finally decided by the highest Court of the empire, the Queen's Privy Council, that it was within the power of Parliament to pass the Canada Temperance Act. I say, therefore, it is not correct to state that the Act had been on trial for seven

or eight years; it had been on trial a little over two years. During that time, so far as the popular vote would be an indication of what the popular feeling was, it has met with general favor. I have in my hand here the record of its adoption all over this country, some of the elections have been held very recently, many so recent that the Act will not be brought into force for another year. It has received the support of over 130,688—130,000 of the voters of this country, not bogus names, but actual voters at the polls. In those contests, the Act has been carried by a very large majority in the aggregate. I have not analyzed every one of them, but I have taken some of the larger figures with which it has been carried, and I find that in 23 contests in which that Act was submitted, it was carried by over 1,000 majority. I find that in the counties where the Act has been adopted, the people are represented by no less than 75 members in the House of Commons. We know that in some contests there have been as many as six members interested, as, for instance, in the counties of Durham and Northumberland, and there are other counties where a number of ridings are included. Therefore, I say there are no less than 75 constituencies in which it may be said that this Act has been carried. I ask hon. gentlemen, is it a light thing for us to say to these people, after they have gone to all the trouble and subjected themselves to the difficulty and embarrassment under sanction of an Act of Parliament to secure the adoption of the Temperance Act, that we are to change this? When they adopted that Act, they understood that the use of intoxicating liquors should be entirely prohibited in those districts, but it seems we have received new light, and we now say "you are wrong; you do not understand the value of those nutritious beverages. We in our judgment are supreme; we are not responsible in any way to you, and we say that in the 75 constituencies where this Act has been adopted, there shall be free trade in beer and wine. Every man shall have the right, whether he has been a grocer or a tavern keeper, to put out a sign 'light wine for sale here.'" The same thing will arise in those 75 constituencies that arose in Switzerland when that mode of dealing with this question was adopted by them. Their legislature very unwisely swept away all restrictions on the sale of liquor, and what did it lead to? Absolute national demoralization and destruction, until people saw the evil and adopted the most stringent legislation that has ever been passed in any part of the world. They were forced to do that to prevent the destruction of their people. Yet we wish to remove all restrictions from the sale of liquor, and to say that every man in those 75 constituencies may sell liquor without license, because that is what it means. We have said wherever this Act is carried prohibition shall prevail, and the provincial authorities shall no longer have power to issue licenses. While that Act continues in force, the licensing power of the local authorities shall be at an end, because the supreme power of the Dominion enacts that there shall be no more licensing there. After the people have adopted that Act, we say that everybody may sell beer and light wine; it requires no license, and the provincial authorities shall not come in because they have no power to intervene. That is the condition of affairs that the Senate proposes to force upon the people of Canada—to force, I say, because it is against the will of the people. We know that the popular voice, represented in the House of Commons, expresses a very different conclusion, and is not likely to accept the Senate's amendment. We are simply putting ourselves in a false position before the people. We are supposed to take a broad, reasonable, thoughtful view of this case, and, yet, how few of us have, for one moment, reflected on the ultimate consequences of passing such a measure as this. If it could receive the royal assent, the effect of it would be just what I have described. I do not propose here to go into the gravity of the question, although I have been, certainly, surprised at the arguments adduced by some hon. gentlemen. The hon. member from Halifax (Mr. Power), certainly, must have his lines cast in pleasant places, if he has seen no household devastated, and no drunkard going into the grave, from excessive drinking. He seemed to think that the Temperance Act was an interference with the rights of individuals. I ask are we not every day interfering with the rights of

individuals? Is it not by common consent that the social system is kept up by the majority? Certainly, there is no greater evil, if I chose to take time to enlarge on the subject, than the unrestricted use of intoxicating liquors. It is unnecessary to quote evidence in support of what I say; I feel it would be like reflecting on the intelligence of this House. Many of us have arrived at that time of life when our conclusions on a question of that kind should be sound. There are few of us but have had experience of the evils resulting from the use of intoxicating drinks. We know the opinions of judges of the land, of grand juries who have had crimes brought under their notice, when they have felt that it was largely owing to the excessive use of intoxicating drinks that those crimes were committed. We know to-day that our asylums are filled, largely owing to the improper use of stimulants; we know that it is impossible, almost, speaking for one province more particularly, to get an idiot asylum large enough to accommodate our idiots. It is filled to overflowing, and the inmates are largely made up of the children of drunken parents. Any man who has studied this question, who has analyzed the causes of idiocy, must have come to the conclusion that there is no more potent factor in the creation of idiocy than drunken parents. It is a question which affects not us alone but affects prosterity; it is one not to be trifled with or lightly thought of, if we give it the attention which its importance demands. Some hon. gentlemen seem to think that the medical evidence is not in favor of absolute restriction I have in my hand here the opinions of some of the most prominent medical men of the day. Of late years some very strong declarations have been made by the leading men in Great Britain and other countries. I I will quote a few of them. There was first a declaration drawn up by Mr. Julius Jeffries and signed by Sir H. Brodie, Sir James Clarke, Sir J. Eyre, Dr. Marshall Hall, Dr. A. T. Thompson, Dr. A. Ure, the Queen's physicians; Professor Partridge Quain, Mr. Travers, Mr. Bransby Cooper and seventy-eight leaders in medicine and surgery.

"This document declared the opinion to be erroneous that wine, beer or spirit was beneficial to health, that man in ordinary health required no such stimulant, and could not be benefitted by the habitual employment of such in either large or small quantities, that even in the most moderate doses alcoholic drinks did no good, while large quantities (such as may be thought moderate) sooner or later proved injurious to the human constitution, without any exceptions."

The second declaration was originated, and the many signatures published, by Mr. John Dunlop, in 1847. More than 2,000 of the most eminent physicians and surgeons signed this, including Sir R. Brodie, Sir J. Clarke, Sir W. Burnett, Sir J. Forbes, Sir H. Holland, Sir A. Munroe, Sir J. McGrigor, Sir R. Christison, Dr. W. B. Carpenter, Dr. Copland, Dr. Neill Arnott, Dr. A. Farre. Professors Guy, Allen, Thomson, Miller, McLeod, Easton, Anderson, McFarlane, Rainey, Buchanan, Paris, Winslow, Alson, Syme, Henderson, Lawrie, McKenzie, R. D. Thomson, Couper and Simpson.

"This certificate sets forth that perfect health is compatible with total abstinence from all intoxicating beverages; that all such drinks can with perfect safety be discontinued either suddenly or gradually; and that total and universal abstinence from alcoholic liquors and intoxioating beverages of all sorts would greatly contribute to the health, the prosperity, the morality and the happiness of the human race."

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—They do not say anything as to its beneficial effects in cases of disease.

HON. MR. SCOTT—They speak of it being useful in rare cases. The last declaration, which seems to have been signed by the medical men, was on the 1st of January, 1882. It is quoted in the London *Times* of that date, and I refer hon. gentlemen to the London *Times* for the names and statements set forth. It is a very decided protest against the use of alcohol in any shape. It is signed by 269 of the leading members of the medical profession. The *Times* says:

"It is very seldom that a great social question, such as that of the limits between a wholsome and safe use of alcohol on the one hand, and the injurious excess on the other, evokes such a body of witnesses as that subscribed to the medical protest in our columns."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—You see it is against the abuse of it.

HON. MR. SCOTT—If the hon. gentleman will read the evidence he will find that the abuse consists in using it even in infinitessimal quantities.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, that is not the abuse, the abuse consists in using it in immoderate quantities.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Let us have the document.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I have not got it here, it is in the *Times* of January 1st, 1882.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It would be absurd to talk about the use of alcohol in infinitessimal quantities being an abuse.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I should like to read the testimony of other gentlemen. We have heard that the clergy are not of the opinion that anything more than moral suasion should be used in endeavoring to put down intemperance. I find the Church of England Temperance Society, of which the Queen is patron, advocates restrictive legislation. Canon Ellison appeared before the House of Lords in 1880, and speaking for that society, which he said embraced 14,000 of the clergy of the Church of England, he said :—

"I call your lordships' attention to the prayer of 14,000 clergymen, from whom I believe the call for this committee originated. In their memorial to the bishops they ask this: 'We, the undersigned, clergy of the Church of England, venture respectfully to appeal to your lordships, as the only members of our order in Parliament as such, most earnestly to support measures of the further restriction of the trade in intoxicating liquors in this country. We are convinced, most of us, from an intimate acquaintance with a people, extending over many years, that their condition can never be greatly improved, whether intellectually, physically or religiously, so long as intemperance extensively prevails among them, and that intemperance will prevail so long as temptations to it abound on every side."

That is the ground on which I have always put my advocacy of the Temperance Act. He adds :—

"I cannot help saying, that seeing that the excessive drinking of this country now is of such a wholesale character, and has its roots so very deeply in the habits of the population, you must attack it upon every side. We believe it is like a great fortress—it must be attacked by investment, by mine, by sap, and by direct attack; but whatever other agencies may be used, the strong conviction of all those who, like myself, have been engaged in parochial temperance work for many years, is, that we can do very little without the assistance of the legislature; and that so long (as this memorial says) as the temptations exist to the extent that they do exist now, we shall scarcely be able to make any impression upon the intemperance of the country."

There is a direct appeal to the legislature to intervene and pass prohibitory measures.

HON. MR. PLUMB—No, not prohibitory measures.

HON. MR. SCOTT—That is the desire of the society.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The society is not a total abstinence society.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Here is Archbishop Benson's opinion before he became Primate. He said that :—

"He would gladly and anxiously use any opportunity which the new position to which God has called him in the Church, may give him to promote by legislation and other means for the cause of temperance in this country."

Is not that very clear?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, that is not prohibitory legislation.

HON. MR. SCOTT—He says, to promote by legislation and other means the cause of temperance in this country." Then, I find that one of the grounds on which the society is founded is to promote wise and remedial legislation such as is found in the Society's Bill. I am sorry to say I have not seen the Bill, though I should like to have it. It is clear they were convinced that moral suasion had failed and they asked Parliament to intervene and legislate to remove the great evil. I shall now read the opinion of another divine, a distinguished man who takes a deep interest, as we all know, in social reforms in England, and more especially in the city of London, with a population larger than the whole of Canada—I mean Cardinal Manning. I wrote to him sending him a copy of the Temperance Act of 1878, and giving him

some idea of what we were doing in legislating in this direction. He replied as follows :—

"ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE,
Westminster, April 12th, 1881.

"MY DEAR MR. SCOTT,—I thank you much for the papers you have sent me, showing your successful progress in temperance legislation. We owe you hearty thanks, for the example of the Dominion has more weight in the Mother Country than any other part of the empire. We are making way slowly because much hindered by burning questions which take precedence, but we have gained much, thank God. The League of the Cross is spreading and saving many."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The League of the Cross is voluntary.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Cardinal Manning has been seeking to obtain similar legislation to the Act of 1878. This letter arises from the Act of 1878, a copy of which I sent him, and that is the opinion of the most distinguished divine who speaks the English language.

HON. MR. POWER—If my hon. friend will allow me, I would call his attention to the fact that the most radical legislation which has been sought for in England is legislation which would allow a two-thirds vote in a district to prevent the sale.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I am not now speaking of the proportion. That is a mere matter of opinion. The hon. gentleman may be right in his view; I have always been of the opinion, myself, that this local option law is of very little use unless supported by more than a bare majority, but to vary the proportion would be a departure from the principle on which our system exists. We allow a majority to control the minority in matters as important as that. A minority of the people in this country (perhaps a majority) do not believe in the N. P., yet it is forced upon them by the vote of the majority. A majority of the rate-payers of this city have the power to mortgage my property for years to support some scheme which I do not approve of at all. The principle runs through our whole system, that the majority shall govern. I do not consider this is a matter that ought to be altered in that particular. Though I have never hesitated to say that an Act of this kind ought to receive the support of more than an ordinary majority of the people; I am of that opinion yet, but as showing that this action is a very hasty and ill-considered one, I point to the fact that in 1883, we passed another prohibitory law, under entirely different auspices, and no one rose in his place and said that wine and beer ought to be excluded from its operation. Under the Liquor License Act of 1883, amended in 1884, we made the proportion three-fifths, but we introduced a prohibitory clause in which light wine and beer were not permitted to be sold; they were placed on the same level as spirit was. No one said that light wines and beer ought to be excluded from the Act. We went further than that in recognizing the principle, because we admitted that in some parts of this country no license should prevail, because the local councils refused to issue licenses at all. The province of Quebec, many years ago, authorized the different parishes to pass by-laws prohibiting the sale of liquor without any legislation at all. Fearing that that might be illegal, in 1884 we confirmed and approved of that legislation in Lower Canada. Only last session, what did we say? In the Liquor License Act Amendment Bill we added a sub-section to section 45 of the Act, providing that in the province of Quebec the municipal councils "may by by-law restrict or prohibit within the limits of such town, village, parish or township, the sale of intoxicating liquors." Then, we added another as a third sub-section, providing that in every town, village, or parish, or township where any such by-law had been passed, we affirmed it, providing that it was not then subject matter of litigation in the courts —that is the only exception we made. We affirmed and approved of the legislation there.

HON. MR. VIDAL—And that was a Government measure.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Yes, a Government measure. I ask this House is it not extremely inconsistent, in the face of that, for us to create all this confusion and say to the people, "because you adopted the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, we shall create absolute confusion in your

counties?" That is what it will result in. It will be free trade in liquor. Any man may sell it. He need not be a saloon keeper —any man, in trade or out of trade, may deal in wine and beer; every shop along the street may be turned into a beer and light wines saloon.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend must know that that statement is not warranted. My hon. friend from Sarnia called on me and suggested that that was a possible difficulty, and I said at once if this became law the Government would introduce a measure to prevent anything of the kind.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Then I am perfectly right in what I say. If my hon. friend's attention had not been called to it by the hon. member from Sarnia the result would have been as I have desribed.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, that would not have been the result.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Was I wrong in the statement that I made? I knew nothing of the conversation which had passed. between the hon. gentleman and the hon. member from Sarnia. I am describing what the effect would be if that Act were passed. I am warning the Government, and I suppose they will take counsel even from me, in a case of that kind.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Of course we would.

HON. MR. SCOTT—It was my duty to point out what would be the result. The hon. gentleman when he tried to hasten this bill through last night did not suggest anything of that kind.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I should have done so.

HON. MR. SCOTT—If I had not risen in my place and, through the kind consideration of the House, asked to have another day in order that I might present my views on this question, this bill would have gone through last night.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This Bill would have been followed by such a measure as I have spoken of.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman made no allusion to it whatever in the debate, and I speak, and am warranted in speaking, from the condition of things as they are, and as I found them, and as they were going to be until I called attention to it, or told my hon. friend from Sarnia to call attention to it. But I trust the hon. gentleman will not be forced to intervene. I do not believe that the members of the House of Commons who represent the popular feeling, and who are comparatively fresh from the people, are going to accept the amendment, and therefore I regret all the more that the Senate has placed itself in this position, in attempting, when the Act was under amendment on a few technical points, to completely subvert the original intention of Parliament, because I call it an utter subversion of the Act. The farce of talking of light wines, as if such a thing as light wine in its purity could be had.

HON. MR. ALMON—Hear, hear.

HON MR. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman doubts it. I tell him that if he consults the London *Times*, he will find the result of an official examination into the purity of wines that were brought into the city of Paris. As everybody knows, a most careful analysis of the food and drink taken into the city of Paris is made, and in 1881 the Government analyst took 3,001 samples of wine and analysed them, and what was the result of his examination? He found only 279 out of the 3,001 samples of wine to be good, and that in Paris, the centre, it is supposed, of the great country where wine can be procured in its purity, and where it is supposed that the palates of those who can afford it, at all events, will insist on having good wine. Out of the 3,001 samples it was found that there were 279 good; 991 passable, and 1,731 bad. The bulk of them were found to be adulterated with tartaric, acetic, tannic, sulphuric acids and alum, colored with leaves of cherry, laurel and logwood. These are the compounds that go to make up those "pure light wines." As a matter of fact, France has been for some four or five years importing more wine than she exports. Owing to the destruction of the vines by the phylloxera, France could not grow her own wines. The wine merchants

did not want to give up their trade, however, any more than the brewers did when the hops failed in this country. They found substitutes for wine, and so trade went on; customers were not disappointed in giving their orders, but the wine was different, and the clever chemical compounds prepared by practiced hands to-day are difficult to detect as a spurious article, and that it is not genuine wine. I might, myself, have no objection to light wines—not the same objection that I otherwise would if we could get the wines that people some forty or fifty years ago used, before the tricks of the trade had managed to make wines out of chemical compounds.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Before modern philosophers had made everything uncomfortable.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Before the greed of man had become so insatiable, and science had been called in to its assistance. Money making was the main cause of adulteration, and when the wine crop failed, instead of waiting for another year, without wine, the public had to be satisfied with wine made out of compounds that, by chemical analysis, contain no part of the juice of the grape.

HON. MR. DEVER—The hon. gentleman is imposing on the credulity of the people. It is all humbug.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I have an authority here. Mr. Viztelly, the British Wine Commissioner to the Vienna Wine Exposition, who writes in his "Wines of the World," (London 1875) as follows:—

> Now-a-days spurious port is produced on a large scale at Tarragon, in Spain, which imports considerable quantities of dried elderberries, presumably for deepening the color if not actually for adulterating, the so-called "Spanish Reds." A couple of years ago, I tested scores of samples of fictitious ports, in every stage of early and intermediate development, rough, fruity, fiery, rounded and tawny, in the cellars of some of the largest manufacturers at Cette, and saw some thousands of pipes of converted Rousillon wines, lying ready for shipment to England, and various northern countries as vintage ports."

HON MR. PLUMB—He made a good article, and it did not hurt anybody.

HON. MR. SCOTT—He says, later on, about sherry:—

> "The wine, which forms the bulk of the better class of sherries imported into England, is of the third quality, and is known as *raya*. In its natural state it is sound and dry, of a pale greenish-yellow color, and has no particular character. Much of the low-class sherry, shipped from Cadiz, is blended, moreover, with poor white wine, from the Contado de Niebla. When the wine is designed for shipment, it is sweetened and flavored to disguise its deficiencies of taste, and colored in order that it may be palmed off as old and matured—coloring matter and reddish-brown liquid, strongly charged with sulphate of potash; then, to prevent fermentation, proof spirits are added."

In the leading article of the London *Times*, December 10th, 1873, there is this article:—

> "The correspondence which we have lately published on the manufacture of the liquid sold in this country under the name of "sherry," seems calculated to shake even the robust faith of the British householder in the merits of his favorite beverage. The correspondence had its origin in the fate of an unfortunate gentleman who has found, by the verdict of the coroner's jury, to have died from an over-dose of alcohol, taken in four gills of sherry; and, as it proceeded, it gradually unfolded some of the mysteries of the processes by which the product called sherry is obtained. In the first place, it seems that the grapes, before being trodden and pressed, are dusted over with a large quantity of plaster of Paris (sulpate of lime), an addition which removes the tartaric and malic acids from the juice, and leaves sulphuric acid in their stead, so that the "must" contains none of the bitartate of potash which is the natural salt of the wine, but sulphate of potash instead, usually in the proportion of about two ounces to a gallon.
>
> "Besides this, the common varieties of 'must' receive an additional pound of sulphuric acid to each butt, by being impregnated with the fumes of five ounces of sulphur. When fermentation is complete, the wine may contain from a minimum of about 14, to a maximum of 27·5 per cent. of proof spirit; but it is not yet in a state to satisfy the demands of the English market, neither can it be trusted to travel without undergoing secondary fermentation or other changes. It is therefore treated with a variety of ingredients to impart color, sweetness, and flavor; and it receives an addition of sufficient brandy to raise the alcoholic strength of the mixture to 35 per cent. as a minimum, or in some cases to as much as 59 per cent. of proof spirit. When all this has been done, it is shipped in the wood for England, where it is either bottled as 'pure' wine, or is subjected to such further sophistications as the ingenuity of dealers may suggest."

Here is what Mr. Cole, the Comptroller of the Customs in the London docks, says. We all know that large quantities of wine are vatted and mixed in these docks. He says of these mixtures himself, in October, 1850, they were :—

"Spanish wine, 1,529 gallons; of Fayal wine, 544 gallons; of French wines, 4,492 gallons; of Cape wines, 689 gallons; of Portugal wine only 117 gallons, with 155 gallons of brandy, the result obtained being 7,524 gallons, minus 8 gallons loss; and the result is 7,533 gallons of wine."

Dr. Baer states that in the adulteration of wines the coloring matters play a deadly part :—

"Not only light wines but mixtures, in which there has never been any grape juice, are artificially dyed and brought into the trade as precious red wines. To this end vegetable dyes are used, such as mallow-bloom, whortleberries, elderberries, cochineal, logwood * * and in modern times the aniline dye, fuchsia, especially dangerous, because of the arsenic it contains."

Mr. Viztelly, the gentleman from whose work I quoted before, devotes some attention to beer, and says :—

"The popular notion that the intoxicating influence of English beer is due exclusively to its alcoholic strength is an erroneous one, for there are many beers containing only a very small quantity of alcohol, that are highly stupefying, most likely due to the use of cocculus indicus.

"Of course the chief adulterations used for beers are water and salt. To conceal the water dilution, and as substitutes for hops, a number of bitter stuffs are used—picric acid, aloes, quassia, buckbean, cocculus indicus, and gentian, supply the taste of hops; phosphoric acid the hop aroma; and for the headings or froths there are concoctions of alum, copperas, sweet wort, molasses, and cocculus indicus. As a substitute for alcohol, the cocculus indicus berry which, in its poisonous power, surpasses prussic acid, is being imported in steadily increasing quantities into England."

So much for the purity of English wine. Now, what is our own view of spurious wines? We have had a little legislation on that ourselves. I will quote now from the last Inland Revenue Act, which provides for the manufacture of "compounded spirits." The term "compounded spirits" is interpreted to mean and include "all articles containing Canadian or other spirits which are enumerated in the schedule to this Act." The term "compounder" is interpreted to mean and include "every person who, by himself or his agent, compounds or mixes for sale by wholesale any of the articles enumerated in the schedule to this Act." The "compounder" is bound to take out a license, and what is that compounder authorized to do? He is authorized, on a payment to our Revenue Department of $50, to manufacture imitations of British or foreign wines, of brandy, rum, gin, Old Tom, Geneva, Schnapps, British or foreign whiskey, and bitter liquors and cordials when containing alcohol. That is what he is entitled to do by our own Inland Revenue Act, and that he does it, there is abundance of proof all over the country, and if you go into an ordinary tavern you will find—

HON. MR. PLUMB—Whose Act is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

HON. MR. SCOTT—I am quoting from the statute of 1883, and if the hon. gentleman does not interrupt me I will give him an illustration of how it is done. I stated at the outset that I was reading from an Act of the Parliament of this country.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I wanted to know the year, because I want to refer to that Act.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I commenced by stating what we ourselves authorize. No doubt an effort would be made to show that we do not get these imitation wines in this country. I tell you that we authorize them to be made here. The manufacturers do not require a pound of grapes in order to make them and we allow them to make just the articles named in the schedule of this Act.

HON. MR. DEVER—There is no such thing as wine made out of grapes.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I am very glad my hon. friend has admitted that.

HON. MR. DEVER—I say it is the sugar in the grape that makes the wine.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I will now read an advertisement that I have taken from the Montreal *Gazette* of recent date. It is a very important matter, bearing directly

upon the question under consideration, and is as follows:—

CANADIAN WINES!

Champagnes, Sauternes, Clarets, Vermouth, Sherries, Ports, Bourgoyne, Canadian and other brands of guaranteed perfect purity, excellent body and flavour, fine bouquet and otherwise suitable alike for luncheon, dinner or ordinary use. Supplied in any quantities in wood or bottle by

BARRE & CO.,
Manufacturers of pure Canadian wines.

HON. MR. SMITH—Where does that firm do business?

HON. MR. SCOTT—That house carries on business in Montreal, at 186 and 188 Fortification Lane. I dare say my hon. friend knows them. They are a very successful wine house, and they have authority, under that Act, by paying a license fee of $50, to manufacture and sell imitations of British and foreign wines, and that is the compound that the hon. gentleman says should be foisted on this country as a wholesome and nutritious beverage.

HON. MR. SMITH—What is the date of that Act?

HON. MR. SCOTT—1883.

HON. MR. ALMON—What is the strength of the wine?

HON. MR. SCOTT—Does the hon. gentleman imagine that one-tenth of one per cent. of the wines of this country are tested as to their strength, except by the Excise or Customs Officers, when they are manufactured in or imported into the country? I say no, not a tenth of one per cent. of the wines are analyzed as to strength. Up to late years we have had but one analyst in the Dominion, Dr. Edwards, of Montreal. Recently, we have added four others—one at Toronto, one at Halifax, and one at some other important points; and does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that, because we have these analysts, they are going to analyze all the wines used in the Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific? That all the saloons and taverns in the country are going to be visited by these five analysts, and that every bottle and glass of liquor is to be subjected to their analysis! I am surprised that a body of this kind, gentlemen who have reached the years of maturity should imagine that anything so childish and futile could be expected by the people as that our wines are to be analyzed, and that a correct result is to be obtained as to whether they contains more than 12 per cent. of spirit. We must be very simple indeed in our faith, if we believe that the people who are authorized to deal in wines, are going to adhere scrupulously to the limit of 12 per cent. Every body knows that it is extremely difficult to control dealers in that trade as to the hours at which they shall close their saloons, hours which Parliament has from time to time forced upon the trade. It has been found to be extremely difficult, with constables in all directions, to keep saloon keepers within reasonable bounds, and yet, we are told that they are to be honest and sincere enough to sell no wine that contains more than 12 per cent. of alcohol. Does any one imagine for a moment, that if this amendment were passed, and liquor dealers were free to sell wines of not more than 12 per cent. of alcohol, that we would not find whiskey of all degrees of proof retailed from hour to hour over their counters? I am speaking to gentlemen of sense and judgment, and they must admit that this Act would be evaded, and that liquors of a strength and density suited to the trade and calling of the men engaged in it, and the demands of their customers would be sold. I have shown pretty clearly that this light wine proposition is a fallacy. If we could get good light wines, there might be some sort of justification for it. If we could get such wines as were used by the people of Europe 40 or 50 years ago, there would be less danger in drinking them, and there might be some plausibility about the proposition; but when we know that the wine that would be served out to the people would be largely poison—I do not hesitate to say it is largely poison—I am justified in calling upon this House to pause before they think of thrusting upon the people of this country an Act which would not simply allow them, but would mislead them into using those poisons, because they are entitled to

take the voice of the Senate as a guide, as a direction, and as an example. And when we tell them, as we do when we adopt this amendment, that by permitting the use of these "light, wholesome, nutritious, and comparatively non-intoxicating beverages," we are giving the sanction of our name to the presumption, that the light wines that can be had here are wholesome and nutritious, and are not intoxicating beverages? Are we prepared to do that? If we are, we are prepared to do more, I think, than even the Senate of Canada are expected to do. We are told by many hon. gentlemen that the Canada Temperance Act is a failure, and that more liquor is sold where the Act is in force, than where it is not. I am free to confess that I am disappointed in the Act, not from any intrinsic defect of its own, because practically it was as perfect as any ordinary Act of Parliament could be made, passing through as it did. It was defective in some of its machinery only, but so far as the important portions of that Act were concerned, it was admirably suited for the purpose which Parliament intended. But no sooner had we passed it, the very year after the Act was admitted to be a constitutional one, in 1883, we passed this important Act which I have adverted to, the Liquor License Act, which completely upset many of the clauses of the Canada Temperance Act. By the decision of the courts—at all events, of one of the courts, that of New Brunswick, I believe, it took away the executing clauses, and substituted others, and made many other important changes. It altogether took away the control of the Act from the provincial authorities. My own belief was that the Act could be put in force only by the provincial authorities, and we left to them the granting of licenses under which liquor could be sold for medicinal purposes, and arts and manufactures; but the License Act of 1883 stepped in and took away from the druggist the authority that the provincial Government gave him to sell liquor under the statutes, and invested it in a board that was opposed notoriously in a large portion of this Dominion to the workings of the Canada Temperance Act. As I stated the other day, as an illustration of the opposition to it, and the attempts to make the Act a farce, to ridicule it and turn it into a burlesque, in the county of Bruce, when the Act came in force recently, the tavern keepers, whose powers to sell under license, ceased on the 30th April, were on the 1st of May authorzed by the Board of License Commissioners to sell under the License Act, with, of course, a restrictive power; but does any body for a moment imagine that they would be restrained in their sales? The temptation was too strong; it is expecting too much of human nature to presume that those men would be the best guardians to sell under the restriction contained in the Temperance Act. In many other ways has the Act of 1878 been mutilated and destroyed. It is no longer the Act it was at first, and since the Federal Government took away this power from the Local, have they attempted to put it in force? Everybody knows that the Act itself is a lifeless piece of paper; the temperance people could do no more than vote for the Act, and bring it into operation; their power then ceased. It is an Act that has evoked the hostility of many of the minority. It is an Act that many people do not regard as one of the ten commandments, having moral weight or power, or like one of the Acts passed for the repression of crime, and there was no one especially interested in putting the Act in force, excepting the executive power. We have practically removed that power from the Provincial, centreing it in the Federal authority, and the Act must be a failure under such circumstances, as it cannot go into operation on its own account. It has no vitality of its own. If a man is assaulted he at once brings his case under the notice of the police magistrate. If he is robbed he at once lays information, and the constables are put upon the path of the robber. If his house is burned, or any wrong is done to himself or to his property, he is interested, and all society is interested in enforcing the law; but there is no such motive, no such impulse, in a case under the Temperance Act, and it is, no doubt, as described by the hon. gentleman on my right, the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island, last year, that free liquor is sold. I say that it is a thing deeply to be regretted that the Act should be adopted in any municipality where it is not intended to be put in force.

You cannot say the Act is a failure simply because it will not go into operation of its own mere motion. It cannot; it must be enforced. For two or three years, at all events, it will require a very considerable staff of constables, and entail a good deal of cost, but it will remove the open temptation, the open bar; and our young men will not be seduced as often as they otherwise would be into habits of tippling. After all it is not the old toper, the man who has passed the meridian of life, who has formed habits that it is difficult to break, it is the young men who are heirs to this great heritage we are leaving them that they may be free from the vice of intemperance. The object of this legislation is that they may grow up and not be tempted day by day. What father is there that takes any pleasure or pride to see his son go into a bar, even if it is only to drink wine or beer? Does he not feel a thrill of horror through him as to what the ultimate consequence of that may be? There are few of us who have not seen the skeleton in the closet, and every one appreciates this matter when it is brought home to himself. We are here to protect the people from their weaknesses in that direction, to save our young men from the destruction which awaits them if this vice is not removed. My theory has always been that, given the opportunity, you are sure to convert people into tipplers. I have watched this question carefully, and I have found that the more opportunities for drinking, the more drinking there will be. Say there are a dozen saloons in a population of two or three thousand, and I venture to say there will be more people entering those saloons than if there were only half that number. Last year, I passed through Port Arthur. Of course it was an exceptional place, but I found that the town was demoralized. They had availed themselves of the License Act of the local legislature and the License Act of the Dominion. They had no objection to either of them; and what was the consequence? In that little town almost every shop in the main streets was a saloon and every one of them was thronged with men whose hard earnings, when they came in to be paid, instead of being deposited in the savings bank, were swallowed up by the tavern keepers. The town authorities were interested, too, I found, because they brought up the men every day and fined them $1 and let them go. So the town got a revenue from this traffic in human degradation. I never was more shocked in my life and never was more struck with the force of the observation I have made—that given the opportunity the effect is to create a greater amount of tippling. It was simply due to the fact that the open saloon was there both by night and by day, at all times and in all directions. There was, no doubt, light wine and beer there, but it was all made up of poisonous stuff. I would a good deal rather see a man drink the pure spirit, diluted with water, than those poisonous stuffs. But I do not believe, with the conventional taste of the day, that even Old Tom or Old Rye possesses the desired flavor. There is a dryness, or some peculiar odor, that is needed, and that can only be imparted by chemicals. What has been the effects of chemicals? Let any man read of the drunkenness of fifty years ago, and compare it with the drunkenness of to-day. The man who got drunk fifty years ago, became jolly.

HON. MR. ALMON—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SCOTT—Yes; I can remember it myself. I can remember how men shook hands and hugged each other, when under the influence of liquor; but what is the effect of drunkenness to-day? It leads to fighting, the drawing of the knife, the wounding, the killing.

HON. MR. SMITH—Is that the effect that wine had on you when you drank it?

HON. MR. SCOTT—I do not give my own personal experience. Probably my own personal experience might be interesting to the House. I speak of my observation on others as well as on myself, and I say the liquor that is drunk to-day, is different from what was drunk fifty years ago, when I was a boy.

HON. MR. DEVER—I say it is not, and I am a judge.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I have myself known a man to go to the gallows, who before his execution said that he had no recollection whatever of having done the

act. He went out one night for a spree, and unfortunately had a knife in his pocket. He was returning with his companions, and in passing along the street met a total stranger that had never injured him. The man jostled against him, and, quick as thought, he drew his knife, struck back and killed the man. The murderer went home to bed, and there he was found dead drunk. He was tried and found guilty. It was no justification for him to say that the Dominion of Canada derived a revenue from the liquor he had drunk, or that the town in which he lived received a revenue from it. That man was punished with death, and with his dying breath he declared that he had no recollection of having struck that fatal blow. It was pure oblivion; and I believed that man. The effect of liquor is to paralyze the brain. Every man's brain is not equally strong, nor is all liquor equally drugged; but the liquor of the present day has that tendency, and a man may be under its influence, though it may not be noticed by the casual observer, and he may do things while under its influence which he cannot remember when he comes to his normal condition. I believe that to be the fact, and it is one of the consequences of the drugs introduced into the liquor. We ought to pause in our course to-day, and inquire whether we will hold out to the people of Canada that those light wines are pure and unadulterated. We have an awful responsibility if we take that course. If we have no respect for the people of our day, we ought to have some consideration for those who are to come after us, for those who are to fill our places when we are gone. The best legacy we can leave them is our opinion adverse to the use of those light wines, although petitioners may pronounce them as nutritious and wholesome.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—I did not propose to take part in this debate, but in an important matter of this kind we, free of prejudice, should do the right for the right's own sake. I believe that those of us who are opposed to the Scott Act and total prohibition, are at least as temperate in all our habits, even in our drinking habits, as those who advocate the other side of the case, and I believe that we are influenced by as great a love for humanity and all that is good and virtuous, as they are. In fact, if I wanted to draw a comparison at all, I would show that there is more true temperance, virtue, and love for all that is good in human nature, amongst the opponents of the Scott Act, than there is amongst those blind, narrow-minded extremists who would unduly restrict the liberties of their fellow men. It would seem that instead of being animated by a sole desire to bring about temperance by Christian doctrines, the love of God, humanity, or by their own example, that the promoters and supporters of the Scott Act simply desire to rule, with but little sympathy for the crushed and suffering of our fellow creatures. This Act is inspired by a sentiment which finds no basis in Scripture. We have it from Holy Writ, that we should fear God and keep his commandments. Now, there is nothing in the whole decalogue which says that a man shall not drink wine or spirituous liquors. The great Creator Himself, who knew all things from the beginning, placed the use of wine amongst other good gifts of His providence, and partook of it Himself, and from His time down through the Apostles, good men in all ages have shown us by their example and precepts that there is nothing injurious or pernicious in the proper use of wine. Paul advised Timothy to take a little wine for his stomach's sake, and I saw a lankey individual the other day in the garb of a preacher, who came to talk about this question (no doubt he was paid for it) who would, I think, have been benefited by taking a little wine, and I gave him St. Paul's advice. I know something about this Scott Act movement and the founders of it; I have had some experience of it, and as far as my knowledge goes it is a curse that has been inflicted upon this country. It demoralizes society, makes drunkards, and then hunts them to punishment. True temperance was making progress amongst the people of Canada until those would-be rulers and fanatics attempted to coerce the people to deprive them of their vested rights, their inherent rights and liberties to do as they please so long as they do no injury to their neighbours. They were not inspired by the highest motives of humanity, because I find them not generally the most benevolent, not the good Samaritans who will pour in wine and oil and help a man when

he is down; they are as close-fisted as any men in creation; but they want to deprive people of what is given them for their good. You may, by Act of Parliament, restrain the abuse but not the use of liquor. It will be used, and the moment you try by law to forbid its use, you lead people to abuse it. We have the Scott Act in the county from which I come. We had a good License Act, but those extremists who would dictate to us what we should eat and drink stopped the License Act. Before that everything went on well, drunkenness was gradually decreasing in the county of Lunenburg; but the moment the License Act was abolished the vilest stuff was diffused throughout the county in every hole and corner, stuff that would almost kill anyone by the smell of it. I know when I went to the place where I sometimes put up in the country, the house of a man who had been married some ten or fifteen years, and whose family was growing up, I saw his wife in distress, and I pitied her condition. I asked if there was anyone sick in her house; she said no, but that her husband, who had never been drunk before, had now been away for two days drinking in a rum shanty. My hon. friend talks about a man committing murder while under the influence of liquor; that is an isolated, a peculiar case, but the cases such as I speak of are common enough. There is no restraint to the sale of liquor where this Act is in force, and the effect of it is to bring ruin on the country. It was never intended that men should, by law, attempt wholly to forbid the use of liquor. The moderate use of liquor is not condemned in Holy Writ. I heard a man once say, I think it was a colored preacher, there is no more good scratching on the outside of the bible than it is on the outside of nature—you must reach the heart — a man's reason and his highest faculties. What you cannot do through education, by moral suasion and religion, and temperance societies, you cannot do by coercive acts of this kind, but you rather increase the vice of intemperance. Everything is against coercion, and the attempt to introduce it in any country has been a failure. Take the state of Maine as an illustration. Since Maine over 30 years ago adopted a prohibitory liquor law, we find that state the least prosperous in the union. It is not progressing with other states in wealth and population, and the soil is actually becoming sterile. The denial of the use of proper stimulants, those which God and nature tell us we can use with benefit and happiness, may be the cause—or the tyranny of the law has probably driven the better class of the population out of the country, and we find that pauperism is largely increasing in the state. The people are either driven out by the operation of this law, or the denial of the use of what was intended for their benefit prevents them from multiplying and prospering on the earth. Everything, all industries, seem to be paralyzed in that state. Yet they talk of Maine as being a great temperance country, and they regret that Ontario is suffering from the curse of intemperance for the want of legislation like the Maine Liquor Law. It is from Ontario that all this cry comes, and it would seem as if all the whiskey drinkers were there. Compare Ontario with the state of Maine, and observe how Ontario has been prospering. It must be in consequence of their being allowed to use their wine and beer in moderation. This prohibition law in Maine has worked evil, and the consequence is, crime and pauperism have increased. Even Neal Dow, the temperance reformer, says that the state is full of low groggeries. There, in the great prohibition state, the banner state for temperance, the experience of prohibition has been anything but desirable, and Maine is anything but a pattern for us to follow. They talk about this Act saving so many millions of dollars to the people. It was once said by some hon. gentlemen that $12,000,000 a year would be saved to the state of Maine by prohibiting the use of liquor, and double that amount by the saving of time that would be lost through drunkenness. Well, in 33 years $24,000,000 a year added to the wealth of the country, one would suppose would make that state very rich and prosperous, and yet it is the poorest and lowest of all the states in the union, as far as industries of any account are concerned. Therefore, it is a delusion and a snare to say that an Act of this kind has done any good. This is the last country in the world that should ask for such a law. It has been shown here by the hon. member from Halifax (Mr.

Power), and it was shown here a few days ago by the hon. member from Amherst (Mr. Dickey) that there is no country in the world that is more temperate in the use of spirituous liquors than the Dominion of Canada, yet we have those rank enthusiasts and those anchorites who parade and inspire this cause of theirs, who refuse God's gifts and deny the grace and the power which they ought to seek for to use those blessings aright. The moment you adopt such a course and deny God—the power of God and his gifts—you bring a curse upon the country. The moment you do away with moral and religious suasion, you depart from temperance. The only way that you can promote temperance is to reach the heart of man, and you must reach it by the education and improvement of society and the grace of God; you will never make a man sober by coercive acts of this kind. But this Act does not stop there; a man may take 10 gallons of liquor to his house and drink it, but he dare not purchase a glass of beer or cider, drinks which strengthen him for his daily labor. He can buy his 10 gallons or a puncheon of whiskey and take it to his house and demoralize his whole family as well as himself and his neighbours, but he cannot purchase a glass of liquor or a glass of beer or cider. It is absurd, it is vicious to adopt this Act, because it is, in itself, pernicious and makes men law breakers. Instead of ennobling a man and making him virtuous, I believe it has the effect of demoralizing him. I believe that this attempt, by temperance extremists, to introduce prohibitory legislation is engendering other vices. Under the cloak of temperance some of those enthusiasts indulge in other vices. Some are notorious sinners. They may abuse themselves in any way that men can, and because they are what they call "temperance men," they plume themselves on being patterns of sanctity and morality; in that respect they are a fraud on the community. Let us look at this very act and see what it means; the form of warrant to be made against a man for selling liquor is in conformity with the act as introduced here. It provides that pure native wine, made from grapes, grown and produced by a man in his own vineyard in Canada shall not be sold in less quantity than 10 gallons. My hon. friend from Ottawa spoke of the pure juice of the grape. I say we have pure wine produced in this country, but this Act is calculated to strike at a great and valuable industry—at the vineyards skirting our inland lakes. A man is allowed to buy whiskey to the amount of 10 gallons or a puncheon and take it to his home and use it there, while he is prevented from purchasing a glass of pure native wine, made from grapes grown in the country. The producer is not even allowed to sell it. How farcical, how absurd, how ridiculous it must be to men of sense to listen to such twaddle and nonsense, that in a country like ours we are not allowed to use the pure juice of the grape which the Almighty has allowed us to grow, and which he blessed and used himself and gave to others to use, and which he expects us to use like all his other gifts and not to abuse. You can find no law of God to prevent the use of liquor. You find the abuse of everything and anything condemned, and it is the abuse—the inordinate use—of liquor only which should be condemned and legislated against. I yield to no one in my desire to promote temperance; I yield to none in my opposition to and abhorrence of intemperance; but I will never be a party here, or outside of this House, to advocating a law like this, which is intended to deprive a man of his inherent right to use everything in temperance and moderation which God has given him for his use. This law is opposed entirely to the Divine command, because these temperance people are setting up for themselves doctrines that are not in accordance with the Divine example or the example of those godly men who have set up as patterns, and they are in vain teaching for doctrines the commandments of men instead of giving us the wholesome beverage which the Giver of all things gave us for our good, and instructed us to use but not to abuse. The moment you pass this law you are saying that the Divine Instructor, the ministers appointed to guard you and your families by moral suasion, your education, your societies for the promotion of temperance, are of no use in this community. You must have an extreme tyranical law put upon you and the moment that is done you abnegate all the moral and religious functions which

should be at work to put down evils that may exist in the country. Therefore, you bring vice, misery and degradation instead of the virtues which ought to adorn us. Instead of making us feel that we should be governed by a high standard of moral action, you are taking it all away and you are placing the moral improvement of the people in the hands of persons who call themselves "temperance men," but who by their actions and words show that they are undeserving of the name. People will only laugh at the man who tells them that he will force them not to use liquor. The hon. member from Sarnia talked about the petitions that have been presented in favor of this Act. The whole basis of this matter is a fraud, because when we look at the petitions which are being presented here what do we find? I have read over many of them, and I find as many as two or three hundred names signed by the one hand. Anyone who is a judge of handwriting at all can see that in every petition the names are all signed by two or three individuals. We generally find a man and woman, probably the heads of the family, and then two or three of the same name beneath them, all members no doubt of the same family. I am told of a case in which that was done, and not only the man and woman and the children down to two years of age signed, but even the name of another by anticipation, and to make it right they called it Francis because that would do for either sex. There is a great deal of that in all those petitions; they are largely bogus and they should not be allowed in such cases to come before Parliament. I think that those who presented those petitions here are responsible for what they have done. I say it is not right to present petitions here containing the names of children who are too young to know anything about the subject of the petition. These are the petitions which the advocates of this legislation prate about. I say they are a fraud. They are absurd and ridiculous, and the House should not listen to them. I believe in the right of petition; it is the right of every British subject to petition Parliament; but when it is degraded by bringing such documents as these before Parliament, the effect is simply to bring the cause which these people advocate, into contempt, and to cast ridicule upon the valued and cherished right of petition. The hon. member from Ottawa singled out one name attached to the petitions in favor of this amendment, which happened to be the same as that of another man in the same place, and he denounced it as a fraud; but look at the way in which the temperance petitions are signed! They are fraudulent from beginning to end! I ask hon. gentlemen to look at the petitions which have been produced here lately, within the last week, signed by 50,000 names, asking that light wines and lager beer and cider be excluded from the operation of the temperance Act! Look at those petitions and compare them with the petitions on the other side, and draw your own conclusions. These are the petitions of honest men, electors of the country, who have a right to petition Parliament. These petitions have been drawn up and signed within a few days, and presented spontaneously by the people, and they demand from us far greater consideration than the petitions presented on the other side. What would the hon. member from Sarnia ask us to do? After a long and exhaustive debate upon this question, in which it was discussed in all its aspects, this amendment was adopted in an almost full House, by 42 in favor of it and only 20 against it. We had three days' deliberation upon the question before it was raised again, and the House affirmed the decision of the committee in another vote by a large majority, and now we have a gentleman who has the audacity to come forward and ask us to stultify ourselves and reverse our former deliberate action not only in committee but in the full House—to ask us to go back on our record and stultify ourselves before the country. I ask even those who voted against the amendment on that occasion to stand by us and not sanction such humiliation as this. The hon. gentleman's proposition if adopted, would make us the laughing stock of the whole country. Nothing could have a worse effect, and I hope the House will not permit itself to be cajoled into doing anything of the kind—to bring contempt and ridicule upon the Senate. I am surprised, I must confess, at the speech of the hon. member from Charlottetown. A stronger speech in opposition to the Scott Act and prohibition never was delivered in

the Senate. There was never a more able speech delivered in this House. I am surprised to find that although he believes this Act to be pernicious in every respect, and he has shown the reason why and where it is pernicious and demoralizing in its tendencies, he still supports this measure. I think I understood him to say that although he believes the Act to be demoralizing in its effect, and calculated to produce intemperance, that it is better to have it on our statute book than to have no law at all to regulate the sale of liquor, and therefore he prefers this evil to a greater one—the unrestricted sale of liquor throughout the Scott Act counties. I believe that we had better have no Act than an Act like this, that has not the support of the people. A law that has not the moral support and backing of the people is more injurious in its effect than no law at all. The hon. gentleman from Halifax also made an able speech to the same effect yesterday, showing the iniquity of this Bill, yet we find him telling us to-day that he is going to support the Scott Act Amendment Bill as it is before us now. I cannot see where his consistency comes in. His whole argument, strong and convincing as it was, in every way tended to show that this is a vicious Bill and ought not to be before the House. I was a little surprised at my hon. friend from York. He told us yesterday that he did not believe in the Act; that he drank his wine like most of us, but because he believed intemperance was an evil, he was going to vote with the promoters of this Bill—a bill which allows you to buy ten gallons of whiskey, but not a glass of beer. We all know that intemperance is an evil, yet my hon. friend who does not believe in this Act as having a beneficial effect, is going to vote for it, because he is in favor of temperance, and because he is a churchman. I cannot see his consistency. The Church of England does not believe in the Scott Act. It has never declared itself through its general meetings as an advocate of an Act of this kind. We believe in the efficacy of the doctrines of our church, and in the inspired word of God. We believe in the commandments, and that there is in them, if observed, sufficient to keep men sober, moral, and religious, and that this Temperance Act is a farce. The Roman Catholic Church does not believe in prohibition at all; they believe it would be going contrary to the inspiration of the Bible if they favored total prohibition. They preach and practice temperance, but they deny that we should coerce people into temperance; that prohibition is subversive of temperance. I have said enough, I think, to show that this Act is pernicious in every respect; that it has destroyed, and yet threatens to destroy, vested rights, and cannot be a benefit, but a curse to the community. Even the permissive Bill in England, promoted, I believe, by Sir Wilfred Lawson, declares that at least two-thirds of the whole electorate shall be in favor of the Bill before it is passed. I believe that able politician, Mr. Goschen, considered that two thirds of the whole electorate would not be a sufficient backing to a Bill like this to give it moral support, power and efficiency in the community. He believed that it required a three-fourths majority. Then we have Mr. Bright, who says that the men engaged in the liquor traffic, men engaged in the vineyards, and those who have their business in and from this traffic have vested rights, and are as much entitled to compensation as men in any other industry when it is interfered with by Act of Parliament. What are we doing here? We are putting the country to immense expense in elections under this Act, which is not only vicious in its tendency but a waste of public money. The so-called temperance men do not seem to care about the expense as long as it does not come out of their own pockets. You go to them and ask them for a subscription for charitable purposes, and you get the cold shoulder; it is their character—

HON. MR. DEVER—And cold water.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—They do not care how much we try this experiment of temperance at the expense of the whole country, and the effect, as we have seen, is to demoralize the people and increase the use and abuse of liquor instead of making men sober. I repeat—such an Act as this would be a curse instead of a blessing to the Dominion at large.

HON. Mr. HAYTHORNE—I do not propose to detain the House at any length for the reason that I have already addressed it on the second reading of this Bill, but I wish to define my position on the question as it stands at present. It seems to me that the course which has been taken by the opponents of the Scott Act, is not well calculated to produce a favorable effect upon the public mind. Those who take the view entertained by the hon. gentleman from Halifax and others who have moved amendments to the Scott Act, I think, should have acted differently from the manner in which those gentleman have acted. It would have been better to have moved for the repeal of the Act altogether, and to have proposed something which should replace it without its objectionable features. That is one of my great reasons for refusing to consent to any of those extemporised amendments brought up by what we may call not exactly irresponsible individuals, because though they are not responsible for the general government and general welfare of the country, they are responsible as individual members of Parliament, but no further. This question of temperance or intemperance is one which ought to be handled by the Government and none other. That is the view I take of the question, and should I find the Government of the day, whether it be the present Government or any other Government coming forward and moving for a repeal of the Scott Act, and intimating their intention to bring in another as a Government measure upon which their tenure of office will depend, then, I say, we shall have commenced upon the right track to obtain proper temperance legislation for the country. Another reason why I opposed those separate amendments—particularly the one which is before the House now—is that, in my province, should the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 be repealed or be rendered inefficient, it has been intimated that we would then be without any law governing the sale of liquor, and under those conditions it is probable that there would be a great accession of intemperance in that province—at all events that the sale of liquor would be without any law to control it. These two reasons alone, to my mind, are sufficient to justify me in voting against the other hostile amendments which have been proposed to this House, though I should, probably, have felt greater difficulty in opposing the amendment that was dealt with yesterday, than I do the one which forms the subject of our debate this evening, and upon that I have no hesitation whatever. I shall, therefore, give my support to the hon. gentleman from Sarnia, in the amendment which has been moved this afternoon. I wish to make a very few remarks upon some other points which have been brought up in this debate. I regret to hear that the advocates of temperance in this House, have made some reflections upon the liquors which are sold, and have endeavored to create the impression that they are villainous, adulterated stuff, injurious to everybody. I think the whole tenor of the speech which has been delivered this evening, in very eloquent and very impressive language, by my hon. friend from Ottawa, went to prove, not the injurious effects of proper wines and beers, but to prove the injurious effect of the imitation of those liquors. The remedy then, certainly, should not be the Act which he proposed, but should be one controlling the sale of liquor by proper legislative enactments, causing a rigid inspection, and preventing the issue of licenses to incompetent and unsuitable persons, and preventing the sale of liquor under any circumstances, to drunkards and to minors. I certainly sympathized with the hon. gentleman when he spoke of the father's feelings when he sees his son enter a bar room, and call for liquor ; but my feelings as a father would be much more acute, if I saw my son enter into an unlicensed shebeen where liquors were sold, and other pursuits even worse than the sale of liquor were carried on. I say that the remedy which the hon. gentleman has advised for the cure of those evils, is really no remedy at all. His Act certainly constrains conscientious individuals to respect the law because it is the law, but it does not constrain the man who is devoted to drink, and who will have it cost what it may, and who, besides indulging his own vicious propensity, drags down with him other men to perdition, who would earn an honest living if they could, but who are prevented from doing

so by this very law. It cannot be denied that when the Government undertook to introduce a law to promote temperance in Canada, it ought, at all events, to have been a law which would be operative in all its parts, and which would inflict no new and additional hardship in the way of trade, or throw any stumbling blocks in the way of honest men, as this law has done, and is doing every day. These are points which we had a clear right to demand in any law, for which was claimed the support of the people of Canada. I attach sufficient importance to the great number of signatures which have been appended to petitions in favor of this Act; but we must recollect that circumstances have within a few days materially changed, and that the other side has now been heard to a very considerable extent, and in a very short time. That other side tells an entirely different story, and I think we are entitled to attach at least as much importance to the petitioners who have expressed their opinions against the Scott Act, as to those who have petitioned in its favor, more especially as the petitions against the Act have only of late begun to come before this body. There were some things that fell from hon. gentlemen, for whom, personally, I have the greatest respect, and whose sincerity I do not for a moment intend to challenge, but who, instead of attempting to convince us with solid and sound argument, began to tell us that our favorite beverages are injurious and filthy. Now, that displays a vast deal of, I cannot suppose, wilful ignorance; yet to hear an hon. gentleman talking about the filthiness of the beer that we are accustomed to drink is something, to anyone who understands the subject at all, so utterly absurd that one is almost inclined to smile at the ignorance which will impute so much credulity to this House and the public generally that they would believe such a thing for a moment. It is a fact well known to the Englishman who is accustomed to the brew houses of the English farms, and English breweries, that absolute cleanliness in every article that is used in that manufacture, and in the utensils, is most essential. The very purest of water, the cleanest of malt, the best and purest of hops are the only articles that can be used by any man who has a reputation as a brewer, and the brew house on every farm must be kept as clean and sweet, and every article in it, as the dairy and the dairy utensils. Can we say anything more in support of the absolute purity of the article that we are accustomed to consume as beer? I, myself, believe that there are no better promoters of temperance in the world than the great English brewers have been. They have, as is notorious, taken advantage of every discovery which science and skill can devise to produce the very best and purest article that can be manufactured, and their success is so well known that English beer is to be found not only in Europe and America, but in India and China.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Then, why not let us have it?

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I think those English brewers are the men who have conduced most to the temperance of the community.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Then, why don't you let us have their beer?

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I have given very good reasons why I object to vote against my hon. friend's amendment, but I have a right to state my opinion, because I do not wish to be misunderstood. If I were to vote with the hon. gentleman from Sarnia, and the hon. gentleman from Belleville, and the hon. gentleman from Ottawa here; it might be held that my opinions were identical with theirs, which is not the case, and I am seeking now to prevent any misconception as to my opinion on this point. I have here the means before me of confuting some of the ordinary misconceptions with regard to alcohol, and of refuting some of the favorite fallacies which are put forward by the temperance gentlemen on their platform with regard to alcohol. I have here an article from the National Review. It is supported by reference to several well known public documents, upon the authority of the learned Professor Leone Levi, and Professor Jevons, members of the British Association, and it must be, therefore, apparent to the House that the authorities are unexceptional:

MISCONCEPTION ABOUT ALCOHOL.

The consumption of alcoholic drinks is all but universal. The great total is made up of the very small quantities individually consumed day by day by 35.000,000 of consumers. For though the 20,000,000 of adults drink the greater part of it, almost everyone is a consumer more or less. Alcohol is the common remedy in sudden faintness or pain, the common stimulant in exhausting illness. Medicines are prepared in it, wounds are dressed with it, toothaches cured by it, chilblains rubbed with it, clothes cleaned with it; the housekeeper uses it in preserving, and the cook in flavoring. Small matters separately, but all of them multiplied by vast numbers, and all included in the general consumption. And when times are bad, it is the thrifty and sober people who spend less in alcohol. The drunkard sacrifices every other comfort first. This simple truth, a truth so simple and obvious that it is impossible to dispute it when once put into words, is, nevertheless, entirely overlooked or forgotten. Any decrease in the consumption, whenever it occurs, is treated as if nothing could produce it but a decrease in drunkenness! In like manner, it is the sober and frugal who have been pinching themselves by drinking water or small beer, when times were bad, who begin to live a little better as soon as they can afford it, and the increased consumption which follows is chiefly theirs. Everyone engaged in the sale of alcohol knows that this is true, and it needs but little acquaintance with human nature, to see that it must be. Those who can reflect reasonably upon these things, will see how perfectly they accord with and explain the fact, that while drunkenness has almost disappeared among the educated classes, and has been greatly lessened among a large portion of the rest, the average consumption of alcohol per head is slightly greater now than it was thirty or forty years ago. The variations that occur show, with great precision, the comparative rise and fall of general prosperity; but they tell us nothing whatever about drunkenness, simply because the quantity consumed as ordinary diet is so enormously greater than the quantity consumed by drunkards, that any changes in the latter are too small in proportion to be perceived. This statement would be accepted as a truism by ordinary observers of English life, if no efforts had been made to disguise the truth. Conclusive proof of it will be given further on, but I shall first give some examples of the manner in which questions of fact are habitually treated by the total abstinence party and their political friends. The National Drink Bill, as it is called, is constantly put before the public as a national disgrace. The money paid for alcoholic drinks, approaches £130,000.000 a year. It is assumed that this is the cost to the nation; that it is an extravagant amount; and that most of it is paid for vicious self-indulgence. The first and third of these assumptions are absolutely untrue; and the second is equally so, if alcohol is used at all as a national beverage The £130,000,000, which changes hands every year, consists of three distinct portions. The first is taxation, which is collected by the dealers in alcohol. It amounts to £30,000,000. The second is the real cost of the beer, wine and spirits themselves, which is about £45,000,000. The third is the cost and profit of distribution, which is between fifty and sixty millions. This subject has been examined and the results determined on the best information available by a committee of the British Association. Professor Leone Levi and the late Professor Jevons were members of the committee. Its two reports drawn up by Professor Levi, are printed in the Association volumes for 1881-82, and give the most authentic account the nation possesses of the particulars of its expenditure. The above figures are taken in round numbers from these reports. The real cost to the nation, as the committee point out, is only the second of the three portions—the £45,000,000 which the beer, wine and spirits themselves have really cost. The £30,000,000 of taxes must, of course, be collected in some way. The sum paid for distribution is paid to the nation itself, and is only a transfer of so much income from one hand to another, for capital used and services rendered. It constitutes the income of nearly two millions persons employed in or dependent on the trade; and if the trade were suddenly stopped the national effect would be, not that the nation was richer by this sum, but that the income of two million people was taken from them and distributed among the rest. These two million being thus made destitute, would endeavour to do something else; and if they could become producers instead of distributors, without displacing any other producers, or lessening their production, the national income would then be increased by the change. But we have already a surplus of people who would be producers if they could, or who would produce more if they were wanted. The labour-market is always over-stocked, and the nation has no power of enriching itself by turning distributors into producers. The real cost of alcohol to the nation as one of its beverage is, therefore, £45,000,000 instead of £130,000,000, with the addition of anything that might be added to its produce by any other use of the capital employed; and as capital itself is superabundant, and can be had in any quantity when there is a chance of profitable use, the addition, if any, could be trifling only. The amount paid for the distribution of alcohol shows that the trade, as a whole, is not a specially lucrative one. It is about £30 per head for the people dependent on it, which is very nearly the general average income of the nation at large. That the expenditure is extravagant in amount is untrue, if beer, wine and spirits are used at all as national beverages. This is shown conclusively when the details of consumption are considered; but, in the meantime,

the fact that the quantity used is practically the same in all civilized nations, disproves the charge of extravagance on general grounds, for the term cannot properly be applied to an expenditure universally and persistently adopted. Nor is the cost excessive when compared with that of other articles. Bread costs £60,000,000; meat and fish, nearly £100,000,000; tea, coffee and sugar, $35,000,000; potatoes, fruit and vegetables, £50,000,000. I am giving the actual *cost*, not the sums paid by the consumers, which are, of course, much more. The cost of dress exceeds £120,000,000. If every person consumed a pint of milk a day, which is in fact a common allowance among those who can afford it, the annual payment for milk alone would be £100,000,000, and the actual cost more than half of this. The assumption that alcohol is chiefly used for purposes of vicious self-indulgence is absolutely untrue. When a man drinks a glass of beer or wine with his dinner there is no more self-indulgence than when he puts sugar in his tea, or butter on his bread, or milk in his porridge. He is simply taking such diet as he finds pleasant and suitable, and the great bulk of the consumption is always of this kind. The public are merely imposed upon by the hardihood with which such statements are made and by the effect of large numbers, the true import of which is carefully concealed. All numbers become large when they are multiplied by thirty-five millions, and the quantity of any article in universal use in a great nation is necessarily an enormous quantity.

I believe, hon. gentlemen, that the substance of what I have now read to the House is literally and exactly true, and is well worthy of attention. It clearly shows the misconceptions which are put in circulation even on temperance platforms, and it is a matter very much to be regretted that hon. gentlemen, with the good cause they have if they would only advocate it rightly, should have recourse to such unwarrantable expedients. I heard, yesterday, I think, an hon. gentleman referring to the majorities by which the Canada Temperance Act has been carried in many distiricts, and challenging gentlemen of opposite views to explain how that anomaly came to exist. If the people of any district, in which the Temperance Act was proposed, were not clearly in its favor, how comes it that those districts should have adopted the Act? That is the question that is put to us. I think there is an explanation not hard to give, and not discreditable at all to the numerous people who, I am confident, acted upon this inspiration, which I am now about to suggest, as a reason for those majorities. They are simply the reasons which have influenced, and would influence, honest minds, and did influence me just as long as I believed that the Canada Temperance Act was what it professed to be, a remedy for the intemperance of the country. As long as I believed that to be the case I could not as a conscientious man go to the polls and vote against it. I believe that hundreds of others voted for it in the same light and for the same reason; they were willing to give this Act a trial and a chance to operate as it was intended to operate throughout the country; but our opinions have changed of late since we have witnessed the failure of the Act to perform the work for which it was intended by its authors. This is the explanation I have to offer for the successes which in many instances have attended the submission of the Canada Temperance Act in the different municipalities, and it is not one which is at all discreditable to those who have acted in the way I have suggested, either by absenting themselves from the polls, or actually voting in favor of the Bill Such line of conduct it seems to me ought to be followed by every upright and concientious man. I could not fail to be touched myself, I admit I was very much so, by the appeal made by my hon. friend from Ottawa when he spoke of the experience of judges and juries and the melancholy death of a criminal, but all these things suggest to me another course than the maintenance of the Canada Temperance Act. That Act has evidently failed of its purpose, and if it were hopeless for this Dominion to adopt any other course than that we have pursued, our case would indeed be melancholy; but my belief is this, that if the question was grappled with by a strong and vigorous Government, and even though we should enroach upon the liberty of the subject in a way made necessary by the circumstances of the country, and in a way that would reach the guilty without interfering with the harmless, then I say the evils of interference with the liberty of the subject would vanish as they ought to vanish when the public interest requires it. I for one would raise no objection to a large interference with private liberty in the matter of securing respectable places where liquor should be

sold. I for one would sanction any necessary outlay to secure the absolute purity of the articles which are retailed in those places. My hon. friend from Ottawa has spoken very freely indeed of the immense amount of spurious liquor manufactured and sold even in wine countries. I will not attempt to challenge the statement of my hon. friend, but I merely say it points to more caution on our part and less interference with an honest trade in liquor. For example, when we have districts in Canada producing a beverage eminently suited for the wants of our people, why should we place obstacles in the way of its circulation and sale? Should we not rather endeavor by all possible means to promote and extend the cultivation of the vine in this country, and the manufacture of such wholesome and reputable ales as won for the English their reputation and trade over the wide world? These are, in my judgment, the remedy for intemperance; it will not be found in prohibition. Prohibition is eminently impossible in a country like ours. Suppose, just for an instant or two, that we could carry the Canada Temperance Act in every municipality and in every province, what then? Does it follow that liquors of a worse kind would not find their way into the country? Does it follow that they would not be smuggled into the country and manufactured in private stills all over the country, thereby debasing the population? I think these evils would naturally follow. In some years, great deficiency has occurred in the wine producing countries, such as France and other parts of Europe. The ravages of the phylloxera have been pretty general, but it does not follow at all that such ravages are to be perpetual. It indicates simply a cause very similar to that which affected our own wheat crops in Canada. We have heard of the fly injuring our spring wheat and injuring our crops until they were scarcely worth harvesting at times. We studied that question, and we found that it was greatly to be attributed to the lingering growth from which the plant suffered in consequence of the abstraction of their natural food from the soil. We know that grape culture has been going on for centuries in Europe, and great objections have been entertained to applying ordinary manure to the vines. I have known cases in which they not only refuse to apply manure, but will not allow them even to be watered at certain seasons, and the failure of the vine is nothing more than we may expect in countries where it has been cultivated for centuries on the same land. When these things come to be investigated, a remedy will be found, and Europe may once more contribute to the supply of America; but we have sources of our own whence wholesome and non-injurious liquors may be derived, and to these, I think, our attention ought chiefly to be directed. One thing I wish to make a remark upon, which is that legislators are largely responsible for the evils of these adulterated liquors. As my hon. friend showed, and I think, with great force, the evils attending a law at present on the statute book, to which he referred; I should call it a scandalous law, and I think the sooner it is removed the better and more reputable it will be for Canada; but for periods long anterior to that, we have been enacting excise laws, dealing with liquors of all kinds, raising our revenue from them, raising obstructions to their free transport from one country to another; encouraging their importation from one place, and forbidding them entering our country from another. These laws have been in existance even in Canada as well as in the Mother Country, and to these are mainly due the first idea of making money by mixing and adulterating liquors. For these things we are clearly responsible. We are reaping now the evils of what our forefathers and ourselves have done in former years, and I think they should be a lesson to us in our time, to exercise all the possible caution in our power in reference to our future action in these matters. I believe, myself, that the liquor traffic is one able to bear a very large burden in the shape of inspection, and for the safety and security of the public it is perfectly right and proper that no expense should be spared in order to secure the health of the public in this important matter.

I regret that I should have been induced to speak at such length, and I feel it necessary to apologize to the House for this intrusion—for, I feel it to be such after having addressed the House

at the second reading of the Bill—but I feel strongly on this point, and I felt that my position was one which required explanation. No one in this House feels more strongly than I do in favor of temperance properly so called, and no one will go further to promote it by proper legislation, but I will not consent to take any part in the destruction of the Canada Temperance Act by what I myself must consider—I leave other gentlemen to decide for themselves—improper methods.

The Senate divided on the amendment, which was rejected by the following vote:—

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Alexander,	Leonard,
Allan,	McClelan,
Bellerose,	McInnes,
Chaffers,	Miller (Speaker),
Chapais,	Pelletier,
Ferrier,	Power,
Flint,	Scott,
Girard,	Stevens,
Grant,	Vidal,
Haythorne,	Wark.—20.

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Almon,	McKay,
Baillargeon,	McKindsey,
Bolduc,	McMillan,
Botsford,	Macdonald,
Boucherville, de,	MacInnes,
Campbell (Sir Alex.),	Montgomery,
Carvell,	Nelson,
Clemow,	Northwood,
Cochrane,	O'Donohoe,
DeBlois,	Ogilvie,
Dever,	Pâquet,
Glasier,	Poirier,
Guévremont,	Robitaille,
Hamilton,	Smith,
Kaulbach,	Turner.—31.
McDonald,	

THE SPEAKER—The question is now on the motion for the third reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—I rise for the purpose of calling the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that as the House has adopted this very important amendment, I think it will be the duty of the Government, and his duty as leading this House, to make such further amendments as will render the Act workable. As has been pointed out by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa, the effect of the adoption of the amendment which has just been voted upon—that is the amendment allowing the sale of wines, ale and lager beer, in the counties where the Scott Act is in force, will be that that sale will take place without any regulation whatever; that there is to be unlimited free trade in these drinks, that the sale of them will not be affected by the license laws of the provinces, because the Scott Act, so called, provides that as soon as it has been adopted the local license laws cease to have any effect. It seems to me, therefore, that it is the duty of the Minister now to provide that henceforth, as far as the sale of wine, ale and lager beer is concerned, the local license laws shall operate.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman probably did not hear me say in reply to the hon. member from Ottawa, that I would take care if the Bill passed that the necessary provisions should be made.

HON. MR. POWER—I did not hear that.

The Senate divided on the motion for the third reading of the Bill which was agreed to by the following vote:—

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Almon,	McKindsey,
Baillargeon,	McMillan,
Bolduc,	Macdonald,
Botsford,	MacInnes,
Boucherville, de	Montgomery,
Campbell (Sir Alex.)	Nelson,
Carvell,	Northwood,
Clemow,	O'Donohoe,
Cochrane,	Ogilvie,
DeBlois,	Pâquet,
Dever,	Plumb,
Glasier,	Poirier,
Guévremont,	Power,
Hamilton,	Robitaille,
Kaulbach,	Smith,
McDonald,	Turner.—33.
McKay,	

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Alexander,	Leonard,
Allan,	McClelan,
Bellerose,	McInnes,
Chaffers,	Miller (Speaker),
Chapais,	Pelletier,

Ferrier, Scott,
Flint, Stevens,
Girard, Vidal,
Grant, Wark.—19.
Haythorne,

The Bill was then read the third time and passed.

The Senate adjourned at six o'clock.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, May 28th, 1885.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THIRD READING.

Bill (76), "An Act to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company" (Mr. Plumb), was reported through Committee, read the third time and passed without debate.

THE REBELLION IN THE NORTH-WEST.

MOTION.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER moved—

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General; praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, copies of the letters addressed by His Lordship the Anglican Bishop of Saskatchewan, and His Grace Archbishop Tache, to the Dominion Government, between the month of July and October, 1884, in reference to the alarming manifestation of discontent at that period, amongst the Half-Breeds and others on the Saskatchewan.

He said: In rising to move for this return, I assume from the latest account received, that the armed insurrection of half-breeds and others, at and around Prince Albert, has now been virtually suppressed. All agree that there will be no more bloodshed, and no one can question the propriety of full parliamentary inquiry now into the whole matter. The outbreak has been quickly and successfully checked through the admirable prudence and judgment displayed by General Middleton, in handling the small force placed under his command; and everyone bears testimony to the unwavering steadiness and valor of our citizen soldiers in every one of the conflicts which have taken place. But the Dominion has to mourn over an unexpectedly large list of killed and wounded, amongst whom are many young men of great promise, and who were highly esteemed in their respective districts. This will long continue to be a sorrowful memory in connection with this struggle. But the House will agree with me that Parliament is, at this moment, imperatively called upon to inform itself by the most searching inquiry as to what were the grievances which drove those half-breeds to have recourse to arms. In the interests of the future peace and progress of the country, this searching investigation should now be made, before Parliament rises. No one would venture to justify, under any circumstances, open recourse to arms, and the subversion of law and order, but if any of the members of this Government, or the officials appointed by them, have by inattention to, or wanton neglect of, their duties, brought about such an irritation and exasperation of feeling, that their conduct has, in a large measure, fomented the spirit of resistance, and called forth a breach of the law—I say, such members of the Government and such prominent officials should be punished. If their wanton neglect of duty, or supercilious bearing, or cold, selfish indifference, sometimes proceeding from the plenitude of their power, or from the possession of wealth—perhaps improperly got—I say if such have, in any measure or degree, led to this insurrection, Parliament ought not to hesitate to impeach such members of the Government or such officials. This insurrection has brought deep sorrow and distress into the households of a large number of our most valued citizens. It has required two or three thousand of our industrious bread winners to leave their daily calling, impairing, perhaps, the prospects of some of them in life.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman is reading his speech word for word.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—The hon. gentleman will be kind enough not to interrupt me.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is reading his speech. I believe it is well understood that it is not convenient for hon. gentlemen to read their speeches before a deliberative body like this, and certainly it is against the rule in the House of Commons in England, and here, when attention is called to it.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—It has been a constant practice in this House and in the House of Commons.

THE SPEAKER—There can be no question with regard to the rule which governs us in this matter. It is not in order for any member to read his speech. It is true it is sometimes permitted to hon gentlemen in both houses, to read their speeches, but when the point of order is raised here, it is my duty to rule against it.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Then, I would like to ask the permission of the House to read this speech that I have prepared, as it is on a subject of vital importance to the country, and it is one on which every word should be carefully weighed and uttered. I will take the opinion of the House on this question.

THE SPEAKER—My ruling is that the hon. gentleman is not in order in reading his speech. Against that ruling he has a right to appeal; otherwise he cannot address the house, except on a motion appealing against my judgment.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—May I not appeal as to whether the majority of this House will permit me to read my speech? If the House says I am not permitted to do so—

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—I do not think there is any appeal from the ruling of the Speaker, but there might be a motion made that the hon. gentleman be allowed to read his speech.

THE SPEAKER—There is an appeal from my ruling. My ruling may be improper, and it is for the House to decide; but in this case, I say that the rule is so plain that there can be no doubt about it.

HON. MR. SCOTT—This House would only be stultifying itself to decide against the ruling of the Speaker, because our rule is a plain and simple one that no member can read his speech, but I think it is perfectly competent for any gentleman to make a motion that a member may, for certain reasons, read his speech. For instance, a few nights ago a motion was made for an hon. gentleman who was not in a good state of health that another hon. gentleman should be allowed to read his speech for him, and it was permitted.

HON. MR. PLUMB—That was an unusual thing.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Whether a motion could be made which is immediately antagonistic to the order of the House, is a question which, of course, I am not at this moment prepared to speak on; whether we can, ourselves, except by universal consent, agree to a reversal of the rule of order is a point which I have not considered; still, we have hitherto allowed a good deal of latitude to gentlemen who have read their speeches on different occasions in this House. In the recent debate a number of gentlemen read from very copious notes and the point of order was not taken; so that it is not a rule that is absolutely enforced on all occasions.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The rule is always enforced when the attention of the Speaker is called to the fact. Very often gentlemen are permitted to read their speeches because no notice is taken of it, but if the attention of the Speaker is called to it, it is perfectly out of order to read a speech. The hon. member prepares his diatribes and fulminates them against members of this House outside, and then comes in here and reads them so that they shall go on the record.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I do not speak from manuscript; I generally speak on the inspiration of the moment, whatever I have to say, but in many cases the reading of a speech might be allowed. Some hon. gentlemen may be infirm or in poor health, or for other reasons might be

allowed to read their speeches. But when an hon. gentleman, in full possession of health, speaking against the good sense of the House, cooly prepares and writes out his speech, attacking certain members of the House, talking of ill-gotten gains, and, under the cloak of a motion for a return, attacks some hon. members, the whole sense of the House must feel that we must rigorously adhere to our rules, and not allow those inuendoes to be uttered.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I make no inuendoes. I say straightforwardly what I have to say.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It is contrary to the dignity of the House, that such proceedings should be permitted, and, therefore, I, as one member, must enter my protest against it.

HON. MR. POWER—There is no doubt about the rule laid down by his honor the Speaker; and I was struck myself by the fact that on this occasion the hon. member from Woodstock was deliberately reading his manuscript word by word. The hon. gentleman is a sufficiently old parliamentarian to know that he could not do that, and surely the hon. gentleman is shrewd enough to be able to attain his end without violating the rule. There is nothing to hinder him from glancing at his manuscript occasionally, and I think in that way he can do all he wants. I wish, however, to correct a statement which he made, to the effect that the leader of the Opposition read a speech in the other House the other day. I happened to be there at the time, and I can say that he did not read his speech. He had copious notes to which he referred, but he did not read his speech. If the hon. gentleman from Woodstock would follow the example of the leader of the Opposition in that respect, he would be strictly within the rule.

HON. MR. DEVER—I happened to be present in the gallery of the House of Commons on the occasion to which the hon. member from Halifax refers, and I am prepared to assert that Mr. Blake did read his speech. I saw him reading it and turning over the manuscript leaf by leaf.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I was proceeding to enumerate the different evils which must result from this rebellion. It must cause an enormous waste of public money, and must injure for a time the prospects of immigration flowing into our North-West. Then, as a matter of course, it blights for a time the prospect of our Canadian Pacific Railway, which, for construction, has already added $70,000,000 to the debt of the country. And what a misfortune to our Dominion, that that happy and peaceful confidence which has hitherto, in the past, been entertained by the Indian races towards the Queen Mother and her Canadian subjects, should thus have been unnecessarily disturbed. This insurrection, although small in its proportion, is an unfortunate break in the onward progress of the Dominion, and must affect deeply the whole of its public interests. I say small in proportion, because, if we leave on one side the Indians who were only drawn into sympathy afterwards, the disaffected half-breeds do not appear to have numbered more than 300, all told. I have several times asked myself the question, and I now ask this honourable House the question: Is it really the case that had the Government last autumn acted with a proper sense of their responsibilities when they sent down to Fort Carleton a large number of the mounted police—and when they were at the same time receiving earnest admonition from the Anglican Bishop of the Saskatchewan, and from Archbishop Taché as to the urgency of their no longer trifling with and neglecting so grave a matter, there would have been no outbreak?

If the Government had then, or even during several months afterwards, done their duty in having a proper adjudication of the claims of those three hundred half-breeds, involving merely the consideration of a few thousand acres of land, we should have been saved the bloodshed and all the horrors of the civil war. Those families that have been plunged into sorrow and mourning and distress would have been spared all the afflictions with which they have been visited, and which everyone feels has been brought upon them by the wanton neglect of public duty, chiefly on the part of the two Ministers of the Interior. Those two Ministers of the Crown openly profess a joint responsibility as regards

the Department of the Interior. At the very moment that those half-breeds were sending to Montana for Riel to come and advocate their rights, and when the demon of insurrection was rapidly raising its head, the present Minister of the Interior went off to the Rhine for his own private pleasure, and to other parts of Europe. While all this was transpiring, the acting Minister of the Interior, Sir John Macdonald, was remaining at Riviere du Loup, thinking he had done all that was necessary in sending down to Fort Carleton a certain number of mounted police. I ask this House, when they look into the facts of this insurrection, can they come to any other conclusion than that it has arisen from the most culpable neglect of duty on the part of those two Ministers of the Crown? They now stand arraigned at the bar of public opinion, chargeable with having, by neglect of duty, brought on, in some degree, the loss of life that has taken place at Fish Creek, at Cut Knife Creek, and at Batoche.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—I rise to a point of order; the hon. gentleman is reading his speech.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I have a right to refer to my notes.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—The hon. gentleman is reading his speech, and I call him to order.

THE SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman has been cautioned that it is not in order to read his speech.

HON. MR. ALMON—I think for our own sakes we should dispense with the rule, and let him read his speech. He loses more time when he does not read it. He puts me in mind of the big Grenadier who was licked by his little wife. When asked why he allowed her to thrash him, he replied, "it pleases her, and does not hurt me." If the hon. gentleman wishes to read his speech it will please him, and will not hurt anybody.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—They are charged with having been indirectly the cause of the bloodshed and loss of life that has taken place in the North-West. It is very easy to excite a feeling with regard to the half-breeds. No one would justify them in having recourse to arms. Certainly, no one would justify any white population taking such a course, but we can hardly be surprised after the experience we have had in this House on different occasions of the unbearable and tyrannical manner in which they endeavor to exercise their power (because they have a majority here) over individual independent members—we can hardly be surprised at their acting in the same way towards the poor half-breeds of the North-West. Those people have sent delegations here at an expense to themselves, stating their claims with regard to their lands, and if they were sent away in the same manner that we are answered here, it is not surprising that they became exasperated.

HON. MR. SMITH—If they acted in the same way that the hon. gentleman does, they would deserve to receive an exasperating reply.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I have nothing to feel sorry for in what I have said here in discharge of my duty. I do not wish to recall one word that I have ever uttered on the floor of this House in defending the rights of the people. I say that the Government have not only been the means of bringing insurrection on the country, but they are trying now to perpetuate their power by corrupt acts, by a tyrannical measure which they know they can force through the other House and which they trust to be able to carry in the Senate, a measure which may bring about an insurrection in Upper Canada. I have heard some leading men of this province say, within a few days, that if we are to have a Government ruling the country by corrupt practices it will drive them to leave the Dominion and go to the United States.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—It would be well for the country if some did go.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—No Government can exist that holds power only by common trickery, by using the patronage of the Crown to corrupt the members and the electorate of the country.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think the hon. gentleman is out of order. Surely, it is not in order to say that the Government are corrupting members of Parliament. It is a direct accusation against every hon. member who hears him.

HON. MR. SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman is not in order. He cannot insinuate anything like corruption against members of Parliament.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I am quite well aware that within the last two years a course of action has been pursued against some members of this House which was never known here before, and is not known in the other Chamber. I am prepared to submit to it, but I will find means of giving my views to the public, views which will meet with the approval of all except those to whom the Government have promised office, and the press they have bought up to support their policy. I can only add that the Government are not only chargeable with those evils to which I have already referred; but are also chargeable with all the disastrous results of that outbreak. The prevailing sentiment of the country at this moment is that they have, by their trifling with this grave matter, brought the direst calamity on the country which could possibly befall it. If they set up the defence, that the officials of their Department have been derelict to their duties, let them say so. But Parliament is bound by every consideration of duty to investigate the whole matter, and, as the prelude to further action, I move the resolution of which I have given notice.

HON. MR. FLINT — No one can regret more than I do that the hon. member from Woodstock, uses such very violent language when he rises to speak in this House. I am sorry, indeed, to think that the hon. gentleman cannot restrain himself so as to place his views before the House and the country. He should endeavor, as far as possible, to use proper language in addressing the House.

Now, with reference to the subject before the House, it is possible that the Government may be to blame; I will not say whether they are to blame or not; that is a question to be decided hereafter. It is unfortunate, however, that the troubles in the North-West have been of such a character as to involve a large outlay and very considerable loss to the country. Taking everything into consideration, notwithstanding that the men who have gone from their homes and their daily labors to fight the battles of their country, have had to endure privations and hardships, particularly those who went out first, in getting to the scene of action, and notwithstanding all the difficulties which have been encountered in suppressing the rebellion, I think it will tend to the very best interests of Canada. We may lament that there has been a rebellion, either with or without cause, but we should feel thankful that it is now nearly brought to a close. The country can well afford to spend whatever the suppression of the insurrection may cost, for the purpose of obtaining the success which has been achieved by our gallant volunteers under the command of General Middleton. Whether the Government is to blame or not, I think the country will gain in some respects. In the first place, we shall have a vexed question settled in the North-West; it will be settled now in a manner that will save us trouble from it in the future. It will also help to settle that country—to fill it with large numbers of emigrants from other parts of the world, who will be in a position to till the soil in peace. I believe, further, that it will have this effect, that it will show to that horde of Fenians, who live in the United States, and who threaten us with trouble from time to time, that we have the pluck, and the energy, and the men, if necessary, to drive them back, if they come across our borders, or to send them to the other world. We know the experience we have had in the past, in connection with the Fenian attempts on this country. It was said, then, that our militia was composed of a pack of boys who could not stand before an enemy, and so on, but now the fact has been proved that we have got citizen soldiers who are not ashamed to show themselves in time of trouble. I recollect, as a boy, in the war of 1812 and 1815, that the militia of Canada had the credit of being fully equal, if not superior, to many of the regular troops that came to this country. Their spirit of daring was such that they were not afraid to take their lives in their

hands, in defence of their home and their country. Now that this rebellion has been crushed out, I trust that there will be no more bloodshed, and I trust that we shall actually be gainers by it. What is the expenditure of a couple of millions of dollars, in comparison with the settlement of this difficulty, and having it go abroad that we are able to protect ourselves, and ready even, if necessary, to help the Mother Country? Whatever the claims of these half-breeds may be, they are being settled by a commission, and the only thing that I regret is, that they are being paid in scrip, which they dispose of, as fast as they get it, to speculators. I have suggested to the Minister that some course ought to be taken to put a stop to it. What is the use of the Government giving them scrip for land, if they trade it away to speculators immediately after they get it? It would be a great deal better if they were to get land instead of scrip. They could not transfer the land so easily to speculators as they do the scrip and then put in claims for more. I hope that the few words I have spoken on that subject will direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior to this matter, and that he will see that something is done to stop the sale for a trifle of this scrip that is given to satisfy the claims of the half-breeds, and that an effort will be made to prevent it from getting into the hands of speculators. I am sorry that my hon. friend from Woodstock is so very strong in his language when he rises to address the House. I hate to see him sat upon by the members of the House, and I do hope that he will take it for granted in the future that it is better to be moderate in his tone and voice, and try to speak with that candor that is necessary in order to secure the attention of the House. He will find that interfering with and abusing the Ministers on personal grounds will do no good.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I desire to say a few words in reply to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Trent division.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Order, order.

THE SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman has a right to reply.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—The hon. gentleman has preferred a charge against me as to my using strong and plain language. I want to know after what has transpired in this House, what is the use of handling those gentlemen with gloves on; it will have very little effect on men who act as they do. But circumstances that have transpired in this House have led me to use the language that I have used and only used when applied to the gentlemen who are Ministers in this House.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—How good of him.

HON. MR. POWER—It is to be regretted that the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution did not, as his friend behind him has suggested, use a little milder language. I do not think it is at all necessary to use strong language in order to convey a strong impression. If one's arguments are strong, the fact that they are couched in moderate language never weakens them at all, and I think the hon. gentleman very often gets himself into difficulty that he might avoid if he used milder language.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—His arguments are not strong; he has no argument.

HON. MR. POWER—The Minister does not like the arguments probably. I do.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—He has never used an argument in his life; never.

HON. MR. POWER—I think it is to be regretted that, in his speech of to-day which ought to be a statesmanlike speech, and which is to a considerable extent so, the hon. gentleman imports personal matters that detract very seriously indeed from the value of his remarks. I wish to say with respect to the motion which the hon. gentleman has made, that I think it is a perfectly reasonable and proper one. It cannot be said now that there is any danger that the Indians will have the hon. gentleman's speech read to them in the North-West, as was suggested to us some time ago with respect to a former speech;

and if the speeches were read to them they would not do any harm now, as the Indian difficulty is about over.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This speech could never do any harm.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Order.

HON. MR. POWER—The House has got, I am afraid, to look at this subject from a point of view which is not as serious as it should be. The truth is, that there is a great deal of force in the arguments of the hon. gentleman.

HON. MR. PLUMB—What argument?

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Order.

HON. MR. POWER—That is if his premises are correct. The hon. gentleman has asked to have copies of letters brought down alleged to have been written by His Grace Archbishop Taché and by His Lordship the Anglican Bishop of Saskatchewan last summer, in which those prelates, who were presumably well informed of what was going on in their respective jurisdictions, informed the Government of the danger that threatened. If it be true that those letters were written, then the Government are certainly open to the charge of very serious neglect of duty in not having acted on those letters.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. POWER—It does seem, from all one can gather, that long before the beginning of the present year the impression had become general in that part of the country that danger was threatening; and surely the officials of the Government up there—the Lieut. Governor and the other officers of the Government, and of the Department of the Interior and the Indian Department—must have been aware that danger was threatening, and they must, in discharge of their duties, have reported that fact to their superior officers. If those reports were made, then the Government have been very culpable in not having acted on the reports. I think that is something so clear that it cannot be controverted. It is true that some hon. gentlemen here do not seem to think it is a very serious matter, and they do not think that the Government were to blame, but we have this fact, that throughout the country the independent press—I do not speak now of the party newspapers, but of the papers which are generally looked upon as independent papers, some of them with strong conservative leanings and others with leanings in the other direction, but still papers known as independent papers—have all spoken in the same way, and have all held that the Government are to blame for not having acted earlier and more effectually.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—What paper?

HON. MR. POWER—There are three or four independent papers in Toronto, and there are independent papers in Montreal.

HON. MR. PLUMB—What are they?

HON. MR. POWER—There is the Toronto *Week*, for instance, which is independent, with no leaning in the direction of the Reform party.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—And the Montreal *Star*.

HON. MR. POWER—There are two or three papers in Montreal, and I think you will find that almost all the press which is independent and which is not subsidized has taken the same line. The Government cannot afford, and the supporters of the Government cannot afford, to ignore that general expression of feeling; and the best evidence we have that the Government really had information which led them to believe that there were grievances in the North-West and that danger was threatening is the fact that when the difficulty first assumed an acute form, they issued a commission, which should have been issued years before, for the purpose of adjusting the claims of the half-breeds. If the commission had been issued on the 1st of January, instead of on the 30th March, this outbreak would not have taken place at all.

HON. MR. PLUMB—How does the hon. gentleman know it?

HON. MR. POWER—It is perfectly clear. As soon as the half-breed outbreak was put an end to, the Indians immediately discontinued hostilities; and if this commission had been issued at the beginning of the year and those half-breed claims had been adjusted then, there would have been no half-breed outbreak, and no Indian outbreak. I think this is so clear that he who runs may read. Then, there was another circumstance. Like my hon. friend on my left (Kaulbach) I am speaking without preparation.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—From the "inspiration of the moment."

HON. MR. POWER—Without preparation. There was another circumstance which was calculated to call the attention of the Government very seriously to the outbreak there, and that is the entry of this man Riel into that North-West country. I think, when that firebrand was flung into the midst of the combustible material which the Government must have known to exist there at the time, that the administration were guilty of the grossest neglect of duty in not having taken steps at once to have Riel removed from that country, or the cause of complaint remedied. That also is common sense. The hon. gentleman from Woodstock, and the hon. gentleman from Trent, have both referred to one very striking feature in connection with the outbreak, and that is the admirable way in which the troops were led, and the admirable way in which the volunteers that were sent out bore the hardships, and fatigue, and dangers that they had to undergo; and I think it is my duty as a member of the community to express also here on the first occasion that is offered, the feeling that the militia Department deserve a great deal of credit for the way in which they have conducted this campaign. I think that, when one considers that this is really the first strain that the Militia Department has been subjected to since Confederation, and when one looks at the mishaps and breakdowns that have occurred in the Military Department of the Mother Country in her various campaigns—a country that has been carrying on war for hundreds and hundreds of years—we cannot feel too thankful to the Department for the admirable way in which, on the whole, it has managed its business. The hon. gentleman from Trent division seems to think that perhaps after all, this war is something which we ought to congratulate ourselves upon. I do not think this is the case at all. It is, no doubt, a gratifying thing to be assured of what perhaps we might not have felt quite certain of before, that our young men, when they did meet the enemy would behave themselves in a way worthy of their ancestors; although I do not think there was much doubt about it in anybody's mind. Still, it has been at a loss of several lives, and at a loss of health to many volunteers, and at a great expenditure of money. In addition to the direct cost of the war, the money that has been spent in getting the troops out there and feeding and arming them, there is the loss that the country has suffered from the withdrawal of all those young men from peaceful pursuits. All parts of the country have suffered in that way; and there is this other and possibly more important evil resulting from the war, that the effect of this outbreak will be, I am afraid, to retard the settlement of that country for several years. No doubt, people in the province of Ontario will not be, to any great extent, deterred from going in there, because of this outbreak; but I think the necessary effect of this difficulty will be to prevent emigrants from going in there from Europe for some considerable time to come. No doubt it has had some effect that way already this season. For the next three or four years the number of emigrants from Europe into that part of the country will be comparatively small. The hon. gentleman from Trent Division, spoke of the desirability of having this matter finally settled, even though at the cost of a couple millions of dollars and a few lives. Inasmuch as the matter might have been settled more satisfactorily without loss of life by the issuing of a commission and the granting of a few thousand acres of land a few months ago, I do not think that the settlement by war is a matter for congratulation. Then, the hon. gentleman said it was desirable that the

Fenians on the other side of the border should know the kind of men they had to meet if they came across our border to trouble us. On that point, I think if the Fenians were likely to trouble us at all, they would have selected a time when we had trouble in the North-West for an attack; and as they have not done so, they are not likely to do it hereafter; and so, that is not a very serious consideration.

I presume—I do not know, because there is no intimation of opinion from the Government as to what they proposed to do about this resolution.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not think there is anything amusing about that. I think it is a perfectly proper request for information, that is, if it is in the hands of the Government, and I think the request that it should be laid before the House is a perfectly proper one.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—They are afraid to give it—they dare not give it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We have not had an opportunity of saying whether we would or not.

HON. MR. POWER—I was going to say, when the hon. member from Niagara laughed at my suggestion, that the Government would no doubt bring down the papers if they have them in their possession.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I do not think it is necessary for them to bring down the papers at all, because my hon. friend seems to be familiar with everything they are supposed to contain. He says there are such papers, and he has animadverted upon the the Government for not properly attending to the administration of affairs in the North-West. It is very easy for him to be wise after the event, but it seems to me he has prejudged this case. If there are such papers I think he should wait until they come down and see what they contain. If there are letters from the Bishop of Saskatchewan and Archbishop Tache, in that country, speaking of alarming discontent existing there, I say it will be time enough when those letters are before us and we hear the answer to them, to animadvert on the Government, but to tell us now, after the event has happened, what should have been done it seems to me is not an indication of great wisdom. I do not know what those reports from the North-West contain, and I should be very sorry to give an opinion as to whether the Government have been supine or negligent, or whether they are, as has been stated, almost criminally liable in this matter. The hon. member from Woodstock says that if the Government had given a few thousand acres of land to those men there would have been no trouble. I say the Government would have done wrong if they had given one acre of land to anyone who was not entitled to it. They had no more right to give land to half-breeds who were not entitled to it, than to give it to white men who had no claim to it. The Government are merely custodians of the public domain, and until such time as it was settled that the half-breeds were entitled to land they should not receive an acre of it. If the matter was brought to the notice of the Government, and they failed to inquire into it, or took no proper steps to redress wrongs, then they are responsible, but until such time as we have information to that effect laid before us, I say it is not fair or right to prejudge the case and assume that they have been guilty of neglect. Suppose the Government have been criminally negligent, this is no time to condemn them before we know for a fact that they have done wrong. I am very glad to unite with the hon. member from Halifax in praising the bravery of our volunteers, and the head of the Militia Department for his energy and ability in placing the militia in a state of efficiency on such short notice. I remember how the Government were censured for endeavoring to make our militia effective, and to organize A and B Batteries; I remember what ridicule was thrown on the Government because they were endeavoring to establish what was termed a standing army. The country realizes to-day the benefit of having a trained militia force. They have seen our volunteers stamping out a rebellion in the North-West which threatened at one time to over-run the whole of that great country. I join in the congratulations

on the heroism and patriotism displayed by our young men throughout the country. Notwithstanding expressions of opinion, not on the part of organs supporting the Government of the day, that the young men in the east have nothing to do with the North-West and no interest in volunteering to suppress the insurrection—notwithstanding efforts that were made to discourage them from volunteering to take part in putting down the rebellion—I am glad to know that they responded so readily to the call which was made upon them, and that they have shown such willingness to go to any part of the Dominion where it is necessary for the safety of the country generally that they should appear. The men who appealed to sectional prejudices and would have kept them at home have been frustrated by the manner in which our young men went to the front. I hope it may yet turn out that the same censure cannot be bestowed on them for fomentink the agitation in the North-West. We have reason to believe that the discontent there is largely due to newspaper articles inspired by the Opposition here. I unite with the hon. member from Halifax in hoping that the troubles, which are now happily ended, will not retard the settlement of the North-West. I wish the same feeling had animated the Opposition in the past, and I hope that the same feeling will animate them in the future, because we know well that the difficulty in settling that country is largely due to the manner in which the Opposition have decried it. This trouble may temporarily check the settlement of that great country. But when people see the command we have there and the manner in which we can so readily snuff out an insurrection; as soon as it is known that our young men feel that they have a stake in that country and are ready to maintain the authority of the Government there, and when the attention of the world is directed to that country and it is known what a magnigcent heritage we possess, I believe that the result will be a benefit to the Dominion and will tend to the rapid settlement of our North-West Territorites.

HON. MR. READ—I think it is quite time for us to judge of this matter when we have the evidence before us. We can hardly suppose that the Government have had information which those on the spot did not possess. It will be in the recollection of many that after the first fight at Duck Lake, there was a gentleman whose store was raided there. He said he knew Riel; saw him every day, almost; that he came to his store with other half-breeds, and he was as much surprised as anyone could be, when, one day, he was ordered up-stairs. That was the first intimation he had that there was trouble, when he was ordered up-stairs, and his store was sacked. He made his escape from the building, and got away. That is the information he gave, and he was on the spot. He said he saw some little sign of discontent, but nothing to arouse his suspicion, and nothing was further from his thoughts than to suppose that an outbreak was about to occur. This winter, a gentleman, who had lived several years at Prince Albert, was at the Russell House. I had many conversations with him, and he told me that he had been doing business at Prince Albert, and along the Saskatchewan, for some time, and that he knew the people in that district well, and he gave me information as to the person who brought in Riel. He said there was a little grumbling there, but it did not amount to anything. I met this same man at Perth, as I was going home, the morning after the fight at Duck Lake, and I showed him the paper. He was surprised to hear that trouble had occurred, and he could not understand how this bad blood had come about, and how the two parties had come to fire upon each other. Now, if these men, who were living on the spot, and in communication with the people there every day, did not anticipate this outbreak, I should like to know how the Government would have information more direct or conclusive? However, there are always plenty to find fault. We are assured by the hon. member from Halifax that it was advisable to remove Riel from the country as soon as he came here. I should like to know how we could do that. He was banished for five years, and after the expiration of that time it was his right to return, and I should like to know what the Government could do with him so long as he conformed to the laws of the land. No Government should be allowed to act on such advice;

Riel had been banished and he returned only when it was his right to return, and therefore, I do not think the hon. member from Halifax could have been serious in advocating any such course. When the time arrives I have no doubt the Government will have to assume the responsibility of their policy, and if they are to blame the country will judge them accordingly.

HON. SIR DAVID MACPHERSON —There is no objection to the address, but I think it is my duty to tell the House that I am not aware of the correspondence referred to. I have made enquiry and I cannot learn that letters as described here, or similar to them, have been received, but if there are any such they will be brought down. The hon. gentleman who moved the address seemed to found his speech upon what he represented to be the contents of letters which I have reason to believe do not exist, and never were written. But the motion serves very well the hon gentleman's purpose, which was to make an attack upon members of the Government, as he usually does. The House is aware that for a long time I have taken no notice of his gross personal attacks upon me. I thought I was acting more in accordance with the sense of the House and in deference to the wishes of the House by not noticing his abuse. The hon. gentleman began the session by accusing me of what was utterly untrue, and making a grossly slanderous attack upon me, and though the untruthfulness of that attack was proved at the moment to the satisfaction of the whole House, yet he has never had the manliness or honesty to apologize for his conduct or language.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman is out of order; he is straying from the subject; he is talking about another matter altogether; he is not speaking to the motion before the House, but he is saying that I have brought charges against him.

HON. SIR DAVID MACPHERSON— I shall not refer at any greater length to these attacks on me. I consider them unworthy of notice, because I do not consider, as I have had to state here before, that the hon. gentleman is altogether accountable for what he says. I shall not enter at any length into the debate upon the subject of the half-breed insurrection. The papers have not yet been brought down, and it would be premature to produce them; but there are two or three facts that I may state, and which it is perhaps desirable should be known, that is that the half-breeds had no grievance whatever in relation to their lands or any other matter. No half-breed was ever disturbed or threatened with disturbance in the occupation of his lands, not in one solitary case. No half-breed delegation came to Ottawa to complain of ill-treatment, or disturbance in relation to their lands. No complaint on behalf of half-breeds was ever made on the floor of Parliament. No grievance existed, and that will be made manifest when the papers are brought down. The hon. gentleman from the Trent division expressed regret that scrip should be given to the half-breeds because they sell it for less than its value. That is quite true, and it is very unfortunate, but the Government became satisfied that nothing would meet the view of the half-breeds in the territories except to be settled with precisely on the same terms as the half-breeds in Manitoba were settled with, and that is what is being done by the commission. The heads of half-breed families get each scrip for $160, redeemable in land, the children of half-breeds get 240 acres of land. They are settled with on precisely the same terms as were the half-breeds of Manitoba, and they are quite satisfied. It is true that they part too readily with their scrip. They are followed, I believe, by speculators who induce them to sell out as cheaply as they can. They are the victims of those speculators to a large extent. There never was any reason to apprehend an outbreak. The hon. gentleman opposite me (Mr. Read) had told what was the general impression in the country, that there was no apprehension of a rising, and when the papers come down that also will be proved. The hon. gentleman from Halifax said that if a commission had been issued in December last it would probably have prevented the outbreak. I suppose my hon. friend is not aware that the commission was determined by order-in-council in January

last, and half-breeds in Prince Albert district were notified of it on the 4th of February, six weeks before there was an outbreak. But it would seem that the very knowledge that the Government had determined on settling with the half-breeds for the extinguishment of their interest in the Indian title—for that is what it is—it would seem as if people interested in preventing an amicable settlement precipitated the uprising. Who those were I hope we may discover. I understand that Riel's papers have been saved, and I hope that some of the correspondence will bring the guilt home to the guilty parties. I fear there will be found among them more than redskins. I fear that unfriendly whites, disloyal whites, men of the Farmers' Union class, have had a good deal to do with precipitating this half-breed rebellion. Until Riel arrived in the country there was no disturbance. Riel is an incendiary, and he had great influence with the half-breeds. From the moment he arrived in the country he was endeavoring, no doubt, to excite them to discontent. But there was not the slightest apprehension of that discontent taking any form more serious than words until the outbreak took place. I shall always regret that I was prevented visiting the North West last summer. I went as far as Toronto, late in August, intending to visit that country. I might not have discovered what others failed to discover, but, being the official head of the Department of the Intererior, it is possible that communications might have been made to me which would have been useful. But I was prevented going, and hon. gentlemen know how I was prevented. When the papers are brought down I have no doubt that Parliament and the country will acquit the Government of all blame in connection with this unfortunate rebellion ; for I look upon it as unfortunate, although I agree with my hon. friends who say that good will result from it eventually. Still, at the moment, it is unfortunate; but I have no doubt, the result will be good, at home and good abroad. Ourselves and our children, from the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains, and even to the Pacific, will, I have no doubt, be more united, and feel that we have a common bond of union and a common heritage, which we failed to feel to the extent that we ought to have felt before this outbreak occurred. It will be felt abroad in countries whence immigrants come that Canada is not a place where they will be left to be scalped by Indians, but that it is a country able and resolved to protect every one of its citizens wherever he may be, that the arm of law will reach to the most remote portions of the Dominion and protect the law-abiding and peaceable citizens. There is another fact which serves as a silver lining to the dark cloud, and that is the conduct of our volunteers. I do not believe that in history can be found the narrative of a campaign more creditably and more worthily conducted than that which has been engaged in by our volunteers under the able command of General Middleton.

HON. MR. POWER—And Colonel Otter.

HON. SIR DAVID MACPHERSON—Within 24 hours of being known, that rebellion had raised its head in the far North-West, in one of the most remote portions of that vast country, our volunteers were on the march to suppress it. We know that they were subjected to great hardships and suffering, but their endurance and their spirit were more than enough to enable them to overcome all these difficulties, and I may say that we have had no complaint from them. I have heard nothing but their praises ; their general has praised them, and everyone who has witnessed their achievements, has praised them. They were proved to be brave and self-reliant, beyond what could have been expected from volunteers—men unused to the whistling of bullets. In the first engagement, at Fish Creek, General Middleton was the only soldier on the field who had ever been under fire, and he showed, by his gallantry, and by the way in which he exposed himself to the bullets of the enemy, that he was worthy to lead the gallant volunteers whom he commanded. A British officer —I may mention his name, Lord Melgund—who has just returned, and was present at Fish Creek, and at the beginning of the battle of Batoche, could speak of nothing, when in conversation with me the other day, but of the marvellous bravery, the marvellous intelligence, of our young soldiers. He said that he had

never seen such material for soldiers. While we must grieve for those who fell, and those who were wounded, yet, as a people, we must rejoice that our gallant young men, the volunteers of the country, have proved themselves so worthy of their sires, and so worthy of their country.

The motion was agreed to.

CANNED GOODS BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of Bill (U), "An Act respecting Canned Goods." He said: I postponed the third reading of this Bill on two occasions at the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Carvell), but he has since told me that he does not desire to make any change in the measure.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B.C.)—I would like to ask if the hon. Minister of Justice has consulted the Minister of Inland Revenue about the changes I referred to some days ago—that is about the standard weight?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The clause has been struck out altogether.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

SEVENTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ADOPTED.

HON. MR. READ moved the adoption of the seventh report of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament. He said: This report recommends that certain documents be printed, and that certain other documents be not printed; a list of them appears on our minutes of yesterday. It also recommends that $20,000 be placed on the supplementary estimates towards defraying the cost of the Printing of Parliament, for the year 1884-85. This recommendation was adopted by the House of Commons on the 13th of this month.

The motion was agreed to, and the report was adopted.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (118), "An Act further to amend the Acts relating to Weights and Measures."

In the Committee, on the second clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: The second clause is a re-enactment of the present 17th section of the Act, adding the words "bituminous coal, 70 lbs." The other day, when the Bill was up for second reading, the hon. gentleman from Halifax thought that this was a mistake to allow coal to be sold by measure, but I think the general opinion of the House was that it was not so, and that it is a protection to those persons who buy coal by the bushel.

HON. MR. POWER—On further consideration and information I may say that I withdraw the objection that I then expressed to the measure, because the clause contains a provision that a bushel by measure may be specially agreed upon, and that will get over the difficulty.

The clause was agreed to.

On the third clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It was suggested that some difficulty might arise because a barrel of apples as defined here is not identical with a barrel of apples as it is in the United States, but I find that it is, and there is, therefore, no difficulty about that.

HON. MR. POWER—I am very glad that the Government have defined what an apple barrel shall be. I think it is very much in the interests of the farmers and of the consumers. The character of our fruit growers, has, I think, suffered in the markets of the United States and of England, just because the barrels have not been of the same size, and very often have contained less fruit than they should.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—What is the capacity of a barrel?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The same as that of a flour barrel.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—That is 2¾ bushels. I believe the American barrel is 2 bushels.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The definition of a barrel for apples is in the 3rd clause, and I am told that it is the same as the American barrel.

The clause was adopted.

HON. MR. READ, from the Committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

The Bill was then read the 3rd time and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself in a Committee of the Whole on Bill (V), "An Act respecting the Administration of Justice and other matters in the North-West Territories."

In the Committee, on the first clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: This amendment removes the limitation upon the power of the North-West Council to impose fines. By the Act as it now exists the Council cannot impose a fine or penalty exceeding $100. Mr. Richardson, the stipendiary magistrate there, thought this limitation threw some doubt upon their right to impose imprisonment as a penalty, but it was pointed out to him that that power is given by the order-in-council and that there could be no doubt as to their right to punish offences by imprisonment. The restriction, however, I think, is an unnecessary one in view of the large powers which the North-West Council have, and ought to be stricken out.

The clause was agreed to.

On the second clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The object of this amendment is to make it clear that the North-West Council had power to pass the school ordinances which they passed at the last session of the Council; and hon. gentlemen will notice that to remove all doubt it is provided that these amendments shall relate back to the date when the North-West Territories Act came into force. There is correspondence from the Lieut.-Governor of the North-West Territories on this subject, and I had myself been in receipt of letters from Mr. Richardson, the stipendiary magistrate, with respect to the matter. The doubt is raised because in some places in the Territories there is, as yet, no system of taxation.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Will the hon. gentleman explain why it has been made retroactive?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Because some of these taxations have been compounded and not collected.

The clause was agreed to.

On the third clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This clause is to remove a doubt as to dealing with electoral districts after they are created.

By the 15th section of the North-West Territories Act, the Lieutenant-Governor may erect into an electoral district any portion of the North-West Territories, not exceeding an area of one thousand square miles, which contains a population of not less than one thousand inhabitants of adult age, exclusive of aliens or unenfranchised Indians.

By the 19th section, it is provided that when such electoral district contains two thousand such inhabitants the Lieutenant-Governor shall issue his writ for the election of a second member for such electoral district. The Lieutenant-Governor is of opinion that having once constituted an electoral district he is not able to change it and in that view we have agreed with him.

Mr. Jackson, one of the members of the Council, spoke to Sir Hector Langevin about the matter when he was out there and asked to have the law so changed that the boundaries of an electoral district could be altered. The two things on which the Act appears to lay stress are that the area of the electoral district shall not be more than one thousand square miles, and that the population shall not be less than one thousand inhabitants of adult age, exclusive of aliens and unenfranchised Indians.

I think that the amendment to the 19th section suggested, enabling the Lieutenant Governor to divide any electoral district which has more than two thousand inhabitants into two electoral districts, ought to meet the case. Mr. Jackson also called Sir Hector Langevin's attention to section 22, by which it is provided that members shall serve two years and retire, being eligible, however, for re-election, and that when a member dies or resigns his seat, another member shall be elected in his stead. He points out that this would prevent a man from resigning and running over again to test the views of his constituency. I thought that the absence of a facility for doing that, was not at present an important matter, and Sir Hector Langevin made no provision in respect thereto.

The clause was agreed to,

On the fourth section,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This section, I suppose, will have to be moved in the Commons. It is to enable the Government to appoint another stipendiary magistrate. The people of Calgary have urged that another magistrate be appointed or that Col. MacLeod be required to reside there. Seeing the difficulties that now exist in the North-West Territories, we think it would be only reasonable to make provision for the appointment of another magistrate, because we have no doubt their work would be largely increased. These gentlemen have enormous distances to travel over, and it is almost impossible for them at times to be in the locality where their services are most needed; one resides at Battleford, one at Regina, and one at Fort MacLeod, and this is to enable us to appoint a fourth.

The clause was agreed to.

On the fifth clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The fifth clause is to provide in that part of the Dominion for what is allowed to a criminal here. He can elect to be tried before a stipendiary magistrate without the intervention of a jury. Sometimes it is in the interest of the administration of justice that a prisoner should have that option. We think it will be found to be a very use ful provision, and one that will save a great deal of expense. Mr. Richardson called my attention to the matter.

The clause was agreed to.

On the sixth clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Attention has been called to the fact that in cases of appeal to the Queen's Bench of Manitoba, there is no provision to allow costs to the successful party. We think there should be some provision, and suggest this amendment to meet that case.

The clause was agreed to.

On the 9th clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—By the North-West Territories Act, no appeal was allowed from a Justice acting under the Summary Convictions Act, but in 1884, a section was passed to give an appeal in such a case. Colonel Richardson and Colonel McLeod, however, are of the opinion that the section of the Act of 1884 is not workable, and this section was agreed upon as being one that would afford the necessary facility for appeal to stipendiary magistrates from convictions and orders made by Justices of the Peace in the North-West Territory.

On the 9th section,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Attention has been called several times to the absence of any provisions for enabling the stipendiary magistrates to admit to bail. Instead of making a special provision applicable to that subject it appeared to me that it would be wise to make a

general provision such as that contained in section 9. The stipendiary magistrates are really our judges in the North-West Territories, and in many respects have greater authority than some superior court judges, and I think this provision will be found very useful in practice.

The clause was agreed to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The 10th, 11th and 12th clauses are to make provision with respect to persons confined as being insane, and to provide for their being taken again, supposing they escape from the asylum.

The 10th clause is the provision for the North-West Territories. At this moment those unfortunates are sent to Manitoba, and the Government of the Dominion pay the Government of Manitoba so much per head for the maintenance of lunatics that are sent in from the Territories and Keewatin. In Manitoba, up to this time, they have been confined, some of them in the hospital, and some of the most violent in the jail. Within the last month or two, arrangements had been made by the Government of Manitoba by which the Stone Fort down the river from Fort Garry has been obtained on lease from the Hudson Bay Company, and that has been fitted up as an asylum, and lunatics will be sent there for custody.

The clause was agreed to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL — Clause 11 provides, that any of the lunatics escaping from the asylum, may be arrested without warrant, by any of the officers or servants of the asylum, within 48 hours after such escape, and within one month after their escape, they may be arrested on warrant.

The clause was agreed to.

On the 13th clause,

HON. MR. POWER—I presume that the laws or ordinances which have been made for the North-West Territories, with respect to the manner in which the lunatic is arrested and incarcerated, provide that evidence has to be taken, and that the Government here are to be satisfied that due care has been taken to prevent any sane person from being incarcerated, because we have one or two cases in an adjoining province where the law has been abused, and out in a country like the North-West such an abuse of the law is more likely to happen.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think every care has been taken to guard against abuse in these matters. In the North-West, every precaution has been taken. An order is required from the stipendiary magistrate before a lunatic can be sent down. I am not aware of any abuse of this law. In consequence of what the hon. gentleman has said, I will make further inquiries, and ascertain if there has been any abuse. The orders are made in the North-West Territory, and are sent down here for approval, and great care is taken in the Department of Justice ; they are gone over by the deputy or myself, and every precaution is taken in the enactment of the law.

The clause was agreed to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The next clauses relate to the sale of arms. Since this Bill was printed I sent out to the North-West, and Colonel Richardson, one of the stipendiary magistrates there, on whom we rely very much, suggests that the burden of proof shall lie on the person who has the arms in his possession, that he has got the license to own them. The general rule is that arms shall not be carried, and if the person is found with them in his possession he is required to prove that he has them under license.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B.C.)—Is there any intention to prevent the sale of arms to Indians? They can buy from the Hudson Bay Company smooth-bore arms that carry ball a long distance, and if they are allowed to buy all they desire it may be dangerous.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We propose to prevent them from buying arms of precision and fixed ammunition, and confine them to smooth-bore shot guns.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B.C.)—There are smooth-bore guns that carry a

long distance. My suggestion is to provide against the selling of guns to the Indians at all.

HON. MR. POWER—There ought to be some presumption as to the writing of the Lieutenant-Governor or the Commissioner in the license or permit. Supposing a man produces a paper purporting to be a permit signed by the Lieutenant-Governor or the Commissioner, it should not be necessary under this Act for him to prove the handwriting.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Supposing a person is brought up for carrying a weapon, and the matter had to be investigated, it would have to be before a magistrate, and the magistrate would, no doubt, take such proof as would be reasonable regarding the handwriting of the Lieutenant-Governor. These things would probably be printed and it would be well known what the signature of the Lieutenant-Governor would be.

HON. MR. POWER—I was going to suggest that, as in the case of other official writings, the permit shall be presumed to be *bona fide* until there is evidence to the contrary.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I presume the Government would issue what is called in some parts of Europe license to carry arms—a stamped document that could not be very easily forged.

HON. MR. POWER—The onus is thrown on the accused to prove that he has a license and he produces a paper purporting to be signed by the Lieutenant Governor and he ought not to be expected to do more than that. The prosecutors would have to show that it is not a *bona fide* license.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That would be before a magistrate and a magistrate would know the signature of the Lieutenant Governor or it could be easily proved.

HON. MR. POWER—It might be well for the Minister to consider whether it would not be advisable to make some provision respecting proof?

HON. MR. SUTHERLAND—I would suggest with regard to arms that the length of the smooth-bore permitted to be sold should be limited to 3 feet and under.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Would that meet the objection of the hon. gentleman from British Columbia?

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—I think the Governor-in-Council ought to take power to stop the sale of arms altogether in the North-West, and if they found it necessary to put it in force, to do so.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We have taken power respecting fixed ammunition, and I think if we adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from Manitoba about the length of the gun barrel, it would probably meet the difficulty.

HON. MR. POWER—I would like to have some explanation from the hon. gentleman from Manitoba as to what purposes long barreled guns are used for, because we may be depriving the Indians to a certain extent of the means of supporting themselves.

HON. MR. SUTHERLAND—The difference is, the longer the barrel the further the gun will carry a ball, and I think three feet of a gun barrel is sufficient for an Indian, as he is generally enabled to approach his game.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We must not be too severe. Does not my hon. friend think that with the provision respecting fixed ammunition it is safe enough? These Indians must make their living, and if it is necessary to have long barrelled guns to shoot ducks with, they must be allowed to have them.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It must be remembered that game becomes shy with the advance of settlement, and therefore the Indians would require better arms.

HON. MR. POWER—I think the Bill is severe enough as it is.

The clause was agreed to.

On the 15th section,

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—When the second reading of the Bill was under consideration the leader of the Government expressed the opinion that a very small number of Winchester rifles or other arms of precision were in the hands of the Indians. I do not know what arrangement the Government propose to make with regard to this disarmament of the Indians; but if I remember rightly the Minister of Justice expressed his opinion on the second reading of this Bill that very few arms of precision are in the hands of the Indians at present. I have been informed by gentlemen who have had personal opportunity of intercourse with the Indians last summer, that those arms of precision are almost universal among the Indians, in which case, it seems that if they are deprived of them, they will be at a great disadvantage in procuring their food unless smooth bore shot guns are given to them instead.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I think the hon. gentleman will find, in some of the newspaper reports of the late engagements, that many of the Indians were armed with bows and arrows, and that some of our men were wounded with them.

HON. MR. MACDONALD — The squaws had them.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—At the time the hon. gentleman from Charlottetown refers to, I was speaking shortly after the battle of Fish Creek, and at that time did not have the information that we have since obtained.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE — The same report stated that some of the guns used at Fish Creek had recently been stolen.

HON. MR. POWER suggested that the third reading of the Bill should be postponed until to-morrow in order that the Minister should look into the question of providing for the production of a permit being *prima facie* evidence of license to carry arms.

HON. MR. VIDAL, from the committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

It was ordered that the Bill be read the third time to-morrow.

The Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Friday, May 29th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE NORTH-WEST TROUBLES.

MOTION.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER moved—

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General; praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a copy of Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney's report on the representations made by His Lordship the Anglican Bishop of Saskatchewan, and by His Grace Archbishop Tache, in regard to alleged grievances of the Half-breeds in and around Prince Albert, during the summer and autumn of 1884.

He said: In regard to his motion, I can only express my own view as to the duty devolving upon Parliament, and especially upon the Senate, at this eventful moment. We have just had to suppress an ourbreak within our own territory, with most deplorable results. It has led to much bloodshed—the loss of many valued lives. While many of our best young men have been killed, others have been wounded and disabled for life, and a large class, from fatigue and exposure, suffered in going there, have returned to the hospitals unfit for their daily work. We have, further, to lament an enormous waste of the public money, and when all the returns have been made of the expenses of the expedition, and the claims from all the settlers whose property was taken and destroyed, with the multitude of claims from other quarters, I fear that the total amount will alarm the country. Now, notwithstanding all that has been said upon a late occasion, this insurrection must strike, I am sure, a heavy blow

at the onward progress of this young country. It is in bad taste and judgment to say that there will not be grave results. I dare say it is very convenient for some parties to lead the country to forget what has taken place, and to talk about the cloud on our horizon having a white lining, but we who speak the voice of the people, who know the injury that has been inflicted on the country, the loss of life and the enormous waste of the public money—the great blow that has been struck at the progress of the Dominion, certainly feel that a most imperative duty rests upon Parliament, and rests especially on this body, to make a searching enquiry into the causes of such outbreak. The great body of our people have the conviction forced upon them, that this insurrection has sprung from neglect on the part either of members of the Government or leading officials acting under the Government, from their neglecting to adjudicate at once upon the claims of those half-breeds who have been led on to insurrection, as has already been set forth, and that they allowed that discontent and discord to go on until it culminated in bloodshed and rebellion.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is reading his speech.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I hope the hon. member will not interrupt me. I should hope that a man who has been pitchforked into this House, would endeavor to learn how to conform to the usages of the Senate.

HON. MR. SMITH—There was one gentleman who was trying hard for years to get into the Senate, and begged for it until the Ministers took pity on him and put him in.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I owe nothing to the Government; they were obliged, as one of the oldest elected members, to appoint me. Instead of owing anything to the Government, they know very well that, because of my independence before Confederation, they tried to keep me out of the Senate as long as they could.

The country expects Parliament to make a searching investigation into this matter. I would simply refer here to statements which have been made in a public journal, wherein it is reported that the Government are in no way to blame for this insurrection. It has been broadly asserted by the Government that the half-breeds had no grievances whatever in relation to their lands, or any other matter; that, in fact, the Government are in no way to blame, and the Minister of the Interior asserted that the half-breeds entered openly upon this rebellion without any cause whatever. How does that quadrate with another statement of the same Minister, to the effect that an order-in-council had been passed in January, to send a commission to the North-West, and that those half-breeds had been notified of that order-in-council six weeks before the outbreak of the rebellion. I should like to know, when a Minister of the Crown rises on the floor of this House, and makes a statement at one moment which he contradicts the next, how he expects the country to believe him? What must the people think of the veracity of such a Minister, or of the Government of which he is a member? I am surprised that Sir John Macdonald, whom I had for years regarded as a safe guide for the country, should select men that would have the hardihood to make such a statement to the country in the vain hope of shifting the blame off their own shoulders upon the shoulders of others. No sensible man will be satisfied with a mere statement of that kind without investigating whether it is true or not. And I now propose to read an editorial from the Mail—the organ of the Government—dated 25th March last, which will prove the want of veracity in such a declaration. The Mail says in its editorial :—

"That dissatisfaction has existed among the half-breeds in the Saskatchewan country for years past, is undeniable. They complain, as we have before explained, that while the Metis of Manitoba were given grants of 240 acres, under the Act of 1870, their claims have been ignored, and they say with equal truth that the Government should at least give them free patents for the farms which they have been cultivating, and compensation for disturbance in cases where the Dominion Surveyors may find it necessary to re-arrange the shape of their holdings, the old French form of delimitation being at variance with the modern system."

Does not that show that those intelligent

and clever half-breeds on the Saskatchewan had not even then received their patents from the Crown, and that they were aroused and excited by the surveyors going in there and disturbing the boundaries of their farms? Yet the Minister of the Interior has the boldness to rise in his place and say that he has never heard of any claims of the half-breeds, and that there was no ground for the rebellion. How can the Government say, in the face of these facts, that there is no ground for the rebellion?

HON. MR. PLUMB—Then you are justifying the rebellion?

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I do not wonder when men continue to be treated unjustly, and their interests slighted, just as we find the older members of this House treated, in a boorish manner—I say I do not wonder that men should become exasperated, especially those half-breed settlers.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Old men ought to know better than to act as they do.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Rebellions have taken place in all countries when Governments usurp power, and try to hold power by acts which no man can justify.

HON. MR. SMITH—What act of the Government is the hon. gentleman referring to?

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I do not want to be interrupted; I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman when he was making his long harangues against the Temperance Act. The Mail article from which I quoted continues:

"These claims the Interior Department is trying to adjust, but it takes time to deal with questions affecting the rights of property. Riel, however, has managed to persuade a few of the half-breeds that the quickest method of obtaining redress is to attract general attention to the grievance by some act of violence; and the result was the raid on the mail bags."

Yet, when those claims were coming before the Department to be adjusted, the Minister of the Interior goes off to the Rhine; the Premier goes off to the sea-side the claims are neglected, and now the Government endeavor to lay the whole burden of the trouble on Riel. Riel was not living there at the time; he was a pauper, living in Montana, and those half-breeds, shrewd, intelligent men, living on their farms, in their desperation sent to him, finding that they could get no justice at the hands of the Government. They sent for Riel, because they knew that he would help them to force their claims on the notice of the Government.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—You are going far towards hanging him now.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—What could have led 300 half-breeds on the Saskatchewan—many of them, I am told, descended from good French families; many of them men of good education and enlightened views, holding good farms—what would have led such men, if they had no grievances, to take up arms and enter into rebellion against the Government of the country? What could they hope to get by it? Every one knows that 300 men must be put down by even a smaller force than General Middleton took with him. What opposition could they make to such a force? It simply shows the monstrous audacity of the Minister of the Interior, in making the statement here that there was no cause for the rebellion. I should not have been surprised at it after the statements we have heard before from the same gentleman on the floor of this House—statements that have destroyed all my confidence in their veracity or in the truthfulness of the Government. I am not going to detain the House further at the present moment, but will follow it up from time to time. I now beg to move the address of which I have given notice.

THE SPEAKER—It is moved by Mr. Alexander, seconded by—

HON. MR. SMITH—Seconded by nobody.

HON. MR. POWER—Yes, I will second the motion.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There were no letters such as are

mentioned, and, consequently, no report on them from Lieut-Governor Dewdney.

HON. MR. SCOTT—But the hon. gentleman will notice that this address asks for a report of Lieutenant Governor Dewdney, on the representations made by His Lordship the Anglican Bishop of Saskatchewan, and by His Grace Archbishop Tache, which may have been addressed to the Lieutenant Governor.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL — There is no such report that I know of.

HON. MR POWER—It may be that the letters of the exact character, indicated in the motion of the hon. gentleman from Woodstook, have not been received, but Lieutenant Governor Dewdney may have reported on communications generally similar in character, and, I presume, if he has there would be no objection to bringing down such report.

HON SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—If the hon. gentleman will refer to the reply of the Minister of the Interior, made yesterday, he will find that he said :—"I think it is my duty to tell the House that I am not aware of the existence of the correspondence referred to. I have made enquiry, and I cannot learn that the letters described here, or any similar to them have been received, but if there are any such they will be brought down."

HON. MR. SCOTT—If there is a report from Lieutenant Governor Dewdney on any communication from either the Anglican Bishop of Saskatchewan or Archbishop Tache, it will be brought down. The letters may not have been addressed to the Government, but they may have been addressed to Lieutenant Governor Dewdney.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is no such report as I am informed.

HON. MR. POWER—It has been alleged that there have been letters from Monseigneur Grandin, and from other clergymen. I think perhaps the hon. gentleman from Woodstock made a mistake in making his motion as narrow as it is, for unless I am misinformed the Premier in the other Chamber did not take the same line as has been taken by the Minister here. In the other Chamber it was admitted that there were communications, if not from those two prelates, from other prominent individuals in the North-West.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is a very different thing. This is the first time I have heard the name of Bishop Grandin mentioned in connection with this matter. It is impossible for me to speak of correspondence not mentioned in the motion. The hon. gentleman from Woodstock asked yesterday for certain papers. The papers he asked for do not exist. Now, he asks for a report on those papers. That report does not exist, because there were no such papers.

HON MR. ALEXANDER—I cannot understand the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman. He agreed to the passing of the Address yesterday. If he believed yesterday that there were no such papers, why did he allow the Address? The Minister of the Interior gave a sort of an explanation—an explanation in which one does not really know where to find the truth. But why did the Government agree to the Address yesterday, if there were no such papers.

THE SPEAKER—I declare the motion lost.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Some time ago, I moved an Address for some papers that were alluded to in one of the speeches of the Minister of Justice, and I think it would be very important, in order to fully appreciate the condition of affairs in the North-West, to have those papers brought down.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have lost sight of the matter. What were the papers?

HON. MR. TRUDEL—It was correspondence, the names of which were given. I may say that I have received letters in which this correspondence was mentioned, giving me particulars, and I have good reason to believe—at least I was informed that this correspondence existed—and that

was the reason why I moved some weeks ago to have it brought down to Parliament. Up to the present time I have not pressed for the production of those papers because I was satisfied that the Government might have reasons why they should not be brought down ; but now that the troubles in the North-West have been suppressed there can be no objection to the papers being brought down. In the meantime I will give the following notice of two questions that I will ask the Government :—

Whether the Government has not, between the 1st January, 1879, and the 1st March, 1885, received from various persons taking special interest in the affairs of the North-West, and particularly from Monseigneur Grandin, Bishop of St. Albert, Monseigneur Tache, Archbishop of St. Boniface, and the Honorable Mr. Royal, Member of Parliament for Provencher, verbal or written representations, and frequent claims respecting the claims of the half-breeds of the North-West?

Whether the Government has not been informed that its surveyors, in their surveying operations, had entered upon farms possessed by the half-breeds, had committed depredations thereon, had damaged the crops thereon, had cut or thrown open the fences thereon, and had divided the said properties of the half-breeds without their permission, and against their orders to the contrary, in a manner quite different from that in which the said properties were formerly divided, often dividing the lands in such a manner as to leave a house on one lot and its out-buildings on another?

HON. MR. POWER—I am sorry that my hon. friend from DeSalaberry did not include in his motion a demand for a copy of the report made by Lieutenant Governor Dewdney's Secretary, who, it is understood, went up in the month of August last to see Riel and Dumont and Archbishop Tache, and made a report. That report would probably contain the information that the House requires.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—I have mentioned in my notice the documents of which I was informed, and I would advise my hon. friend if he is informed of any documents to move for them himself.

AN ADJOURNMENT.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE— I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there will be nothing on the orders of the day for Monday next, and if there is no objection I should like to move that when this House adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until Tuesday next. I move that the 14th rule be suspended so far as this motion is concerned, and that when this House adjourns to-day it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next.

HON. MR. FLINT—I object to that.

The motion was agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, NORTH-WEST TERRITORY BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of Bill (V), "An Act respecting the Administration of Justice, and other matters in the North-West Territories." He said : I stated, in answer to an objection made by the hon. member from Halifax, that I would inquire whether there was any means of making more easy the proof of the signature of the Governor to license to carry arms. I have made that inquiry, and I do not think we could add anything to the Bill which would render more easy that proof, without almost departing from the necessity for it. I find the language we have used is ordinarily employed in these cases, and it is, I am told, a matter which could be readily proved in the North-West, the signature of the Governor being very well known, and the probability is that these licenses will be in print, and ordinarily seen and noticed, and no practical difficulty will arise in establishing the proof of the Lieutenant-Governor's signature ; so, between the slight difficulty which may possibly arise sometimes in proving his signature, and the difficulty, which might be serious, of doing away with the requirement altogether, I think it would be better to adhere to the Bill as it is.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

THE WORK OF THE SESSION.

ENQUIRY.

HON. MR. WARK—I should like to ask the Minister of Justice what progress

has been made by the Joint Committee of both Houses appointed this session with respect to the division of business between the two Houses. I should like to know what progress has been made, because there is a great deal of the work of the session yet to be done. If we had the Insolvent Act up here we might dispose of it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The motion which was passed here I brought under the notice of the Premier, and I asked him whether he thought any progress could be made with that project during the present session. He thought nothing could be done, but at all events he has not been able to reach it yet. They are still discussing the Franchise Bill in the other House, and until they are through with that Bill they cannot do anything else. I think with regard to the Insolvent Bill it is doubtful if that will be proceeded with so I do not think that anything is lost in that direction as far as this House is concerned.

The Senate adjourned at 4 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Tuesday, June 2nd, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE NORTH-WEST TROUBLES.

INQUIRY.

HON. MR. TRUDEL inquired :—

"Whether the Government has not, between the 1st January, 1879, and the 1st March, 1885, received from various persons taking special interest in the affairs of the North-West, and particularly from Monseigneur Grandin, Bishop of St. Albert, Monseigneur Taché, Archbishop of St. Boniface, and the Honorable Mr. Royal, Member of Parliament for Provencher, verbal or written representations and frequent claims respecting the claims of the half-breeds of the North-West."

He said—This inquiry speaks for itself. I make it because, if I understood properly the explanation made by the hon. Minister of the Interior, the other day, it is likely to give rise to misunderstandings. He went so far as to say that no formal claim had been made on this subject on behalf of the half-breeds of the North-West. I do not wish in any way either directly or indirectly, to question the declaration of the hon. Minister, but that declaration alluded, as far as I understood it, to legal documents. It is perfectly well known, that at various times, and even for several weeks and months, leading men from the North-West were at the seat of Government here, and the impression prevailed that they were here for the purpose of pressing for a settlement of the claims of the half-breeds. This fact is of very great importance and may have a serious effect on the trials, which are likely to take place shortly of those implicated in the North-West troubles. In the interest of justice we should do our best to have all the facts concerning those troubles laid before the public. Whatever may be the guilt of those parties who have been arrested in the North-West, they are entitled to a fair trial and full justice. It is hardly necessary to say that the whole population of the Dominion take a deep interest in this matter, and it is well known that a portion of the people take a deep interest in the case of the half-breeds. It would make all the difference in the world if the country were left under the impression that no claim on behalf of those half-breeds, or those parties implicated in the outbreak, had ever been presented to the Government. It is with a view to ascertain the facts that I make this inquiry. I may add that I have had special information from two of the gentlemen to whom I have referred in my inquiry; as to the other, the member from Provencher, I merely infer from his being a prominent member of the other House, and representing specially that part of the country and the parties interested in this matter, that he must have made some representations to the Government. Everybody knows the importance of the position which he occupies in the other House, his intelligence and his zeal in defending the interests which are entrusted to him. For those reasons I make this inquiry.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The House will, I am sure, not be surprised if, considering the gravity of the subject, I confine myself strictly to the question which my hon. friend has put and which he has just read. I will not discuss the subject, even in the slight way in which the hon. member has done, but will content myself simply by replying to his question.

The Government has received, between the 1st of January, 1879, and the 1st of March, 1885, from various persons taking special interest in the North-West, and, among others, from Monseigneur Grandin, Bishop of St. Albert, and Monseigneur Tache, Archbishop of St. Boniface, written representations respecting the position of the half-breeds of the North-West, and the best way of ameliorating it.

There is no record of any written representation from the Hon. Mr. Royal, member for the county of Provencher, and no records of any verbal representations exist.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I think it is a most extraordinary admission after the explanation made by the Minister of the Interior the other day.

HON. MR. TRUDEL inquired :—

Whether the Government has not been informed that its surveyors in their surveying operations had entered upon farms possessed by the half-breeds, had committed depredations thereon, had damaged the crops thereon, had cut or thrown open the fences thereon, and had divided the said properties of the half-breeds, without their permission and against their orders to the contrary, in a manner quite different from that in which the said properties were formerly divided, often dividing the lands in such a manner as to leave a house on one lot and its outbuildings on another?

He said—This question is of the same nature as the one which I have just put, and the few words of explanation with which I accompanied the last refer to this one also.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The reply to this question I must give at greater length than my reply to the former one to make it intelligible.

The Government has not been informed that surveyors, in their surveying operations, had committed depradations upon farms occupied by half-breeds, nor that they had damaged the crops thereon; nor that they had cut, or thrown down the fences thereon: nor has the Government any reason to believe that anything of the sort occurred. Of course, in the conduct of surveying operations, it is necessary that surveyors should pass over the farms of settlers who took possession of their lands in advance of survey, and clause 120 of the Dominion Lands Act provides that: 'Any Dominion land surveyor, when engaged in the performance of his duties as such, may pass over, measure along, and ascertain the bearings of any township or section line, or other governing line, and for such purposes may pass over the lands of any person whomsoever, doing no actual damage to the property of such person."

If a surveyor does actual damage to the property of any person whose lands are thus passed over, he is liable to a civil action, and there is nothing in the Statute to protect him against such action, merely because he is a Government surveyor.

Each surveyor is required to give a bond for $3,000 for the due and faithful performance of his duties. One of his duties, as mentioned in clause 120 of the Act, is to do no actual damage to the property which he may pass over in the performance of his survey; and sub-clause 4 of clause 101 provides that the bond shall enure to the benefit of any party sustaining damage by breach of any condition thereof.

As to the division of the properties of the half-breeds, it would be impossible to devise any scheme of survey which would give to every settler in advance of survey a holding in the exact form in which he had occupied and cultivated it up to the time of such division.

It may further be said that the policy of the Department is, that in case settlement exists along river fronts in advance of survey, the lands are divided on the river lot principle or into sections and quarter sections, on the rectangular principle, as may be desired by the settlers themselves. The only exception to this was in regard to the settlements on the Qu'Appelle lakes and river, but it would have been impossible, both from the shape of these waters, and from the manner in which the settlers had located themselves, to have given them a survey upon the river lot principle which would have

operated more to their advantage than the rectangular survey. A glance at the maps which I will lay upon the table of the Senate will make this quite clear.

It may further be stated, that of the six townships over which the Qu'Appelle settlements spread, three townships were surveyed in 1882 by Mr. John Bourgeois of Three Rivers, in the province of Quebec, whose employment was recommended by Mr. D. O. Bourbeau, M. P., Mr. L. L. Desaulniers, M. P., and Mr. H. Montplaisir, M. P.; one township was surveyed by Mr. P. T. C. Dumais of Chicoutimi, recommended by Mr. Ernest Cimon, M. P., and by Mr. J. L. Michaud of Rimouski, recommended by Sir Hector Langevin. The other two townships were surveyed in 1881 by Messrs. Clementi and Hewson of Peterboro, Ontario.

There is no record of any case in which a house was situated upon one lot and its out-buildings on another, although, as already stated, under no regular scheme of surveys which could be devised could the possibility of such a contingency arising be provided against.

Should a settler at Qu'Appelle be found to have his buildings partly on an odd and partly on an even section, and he settled there prior to 1881, he would be granted entry partly on the odd and partly on the even section.

This river Qu'Appelle winds about very much, and the river principle is to have a width of ten chains upon the river and a depth of two miles. As the river winds, the House will at once see that if a lot was surveyed on this river principle on one bend of the river, and another lot surveyed on another bend of the river on the same principle, the two ends would overlap, and one man's property would interfere with another man's. I think this is very clearly shown on the map, which hon. members who take an interest in the subject can see on the table. I think, however, the explanation which I have given will make it perfectly clear and show that you could not adopt the river principle universally, even if we gave 20 chains on the river front and the lots ran back only one mile. Although the persons interested may perhaps not understand it completely, there is no real difficulty in giving the settlers a depth back, not on the river principle, but on the rectangular principle, that is a part of a section can be taken out of one, two, three or four lots so as to give them the river front and run back some distance. I hope the House will consider the explanation sufficient. Every possible consideration has been shown in making the survey with respect to this question raised by my hon. friend. As I have said if in any case a man's house has been divided from his outbuildings, he has had land on both sections so as to give him his outbuildings and house, though one might be on section 2 and the others on section 3, and in this way his interests have been protected.

TEMPERANCE ACT PETITIONS.

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—Before the orders of the day are called I would like to bring up a matter with reference to a petition which was presented here by me on the part of the electors and people of Glengarry. The House will recollect that the hon. gentleman from Ottawa (Mr. Scott) brought before our notice some day last week the fact that a petition had been irregularly signed, and that a gentleman residing at a place called Greenfield had sent in a declaration stating that he had never signed the petition nor had he requested anybody to sign the petition on his behalf. I have the petition here, and in the first place in order that the matter may be brought intelligently before the Senate, I may as well read again the declaration of the gentleman from Greenfield, if the House will permit me.

CANADA: Province of Ontario, *County of Glengarry.* } I, ALEXANDER MCDOUGALD, of Greenfield, in the township of Kenyon, in the county of Glengarry, Postmaster, do solemnly declare—

1. That I am informed that a petition, signed, or purporting to be signed, by about 600 of the inhabitants of the county of Glengarry, has been lately presented to the Senate of Canada by Hon. D. McMillan, praying that the Canada Temperance Act might be amended so as to exempt ale, porter, lager beer, light wines and cider from the operation of the Act, and that, hereafter, three-fifths of the votes passed in any county must be in favor of the Act before it is adopted in such county.

2. That I am informed, among other names, appears the name of A. Macdougall, Greenfield.

3. That I am the only person of that name residing at Greenfield in said county.

4. That I have not signed said petition.

5. That if my name appears on said petition as aforesaid, it must have been signed by some other person without my knowledge or authority, and is therefore a forgery.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously, believing the same to be true and by virue of the Act passed in the 37th year of Her Majesty's reign, entitled "An Act for the Suppression of Voluntary and Extra-judicial oaths."

A McDougald.

My reply on that occasion was that I knew a good many McDougalds resided in the county of Glengarry, and that I had no doubt that a good many McDougalds lived in the township of Kenyon, and no doubt a good many McDougalds in Kenyon who would have Greenfield as their post office; and in order to clear up the matter, which was a serious one, I wrote to the party who, I supposed, had the petition in charge, and while at home on Saturday last in Alexandria I was handed this declaration which I think will satisfy this House and satisfy the country that the charge brought against the petition from Glengarry is not true.

CANADA: Province of Ontario, *County of Glengarry.* To Wit: I, John A. Cameron, jr., of Greenfield, in the township of Kenyon, in the county of Glengarry, "Farmer's son," do solemnly declare:—

1st. That I had in charge and obtained most of the signatures appended to the petition at this place, presented by the Hon. Dr. McMillan, in the Senate of Canada, asking to exempt ale, porter, lager beer, light wines and cider from the operation of the Canada Temperance Act, and that the said Act should not hereafter come into force unless supported by three-fifths majority of those voting.

2nd. That forty-seven names were obtained and are on the said petition.

3rd. That forty-six of those are from the township of Kenyon, forty-one of whom "Greenfield" is their post-office.

4th. That among those whose post-office is "Greenfield," there appears one A. McDougall (not McDougald).

5th. That the said A. McDougall resides in the township of Kenyon, and his post-office is "Greenfield."

6th. That this A. McDougall is not Alexander McDougald, the Postmaster.

7th. That the A. McDougall on the petition, was put on by me at his request, he having a sore hand at the time, and that I did so in his presence.

8th. That all the names which I secured for the petition, were honestly obtained, and were either signed by the parties whose names appear thereon, or by me, authorized to do so in their behalf.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty's reign, entitled: "An Act for the suppression of Voluntary and Extra-judicial oaths."

John A. Cameron.

Declared before me at Alexandria, in the County of Glengarry, this 30th day of May, A.D. 1885.

D. A. McArthur, J.P.,
Reeve of Alexandria.

To follow this matter up I will now read an extract from the Ottawa *Free Press:*

The Anti-Scottites are not above forging signatures to petitions, and Sir Alexander Campbell, and the government accept these forged petitions as sufficient reason for reversing the wishes of a majority of nearly forty thousand voters expressed at the polls. The latest case of forgery in the interest of the Anti-Scottites in the Government's interest reported, is from the county of Glengarry. Mr. Allan McDougall, postmaster at Greenfield, Glengarry county, learning that his name appeared upon a petition sent from his village to the Senate in favor of the beer and wine amendment caused this fact to be verified at Ottawa. He has now sent in a sworn declaration setting forth that he is the only person of his name in the village, and that his signature has been forged. He also adds the names of fifteen other persons whose names were forged to those Anti-Scott Act petitions. It is upon forged petitions such as these the Government justifies itself in making the Scott Act Bill as amended in the Tory-whiskey interests, a Government measure, when they refused to take charge of it as a temperance measure.

Now, hon. gentlemen, I can say that I know this young man John A. Cameron. I know him to be the son of good honest parents. I knew his father and knew his mother since her childhood, and I am satisfied that a more honorable, straightforward, truthful young man cannot be found in any county in Canada, and I am satisfied that what he states here is perfectly correct. He states that there are 47 names on the petition which came from his post office; he accounts for 46 of those. I have the petition here and I can account for the 47th name, and that is C. E. Plane, a commercial traveller from Tees, Wilson & Co. of Montreal, wholesale grocers, who is very often in the county of Glengarry—I would not be far astray in saying that one-quarter of his time is spent there; he makes up the 47th

name on the petition. Of course I cannot vouch for the signatures, but I am satisfied that a better signed petition could not possibly be presented to the House than this. It shows on the face of it that this petition was signed in nearly every instance by the party whose name is attached thereto. I bring this matter up in vindication of the attack that was made upon the petition and on behalf of the young gentleman who had the petition in charge. I think it is only justice to him and it is only right to the petitioners and the country that I should make this explanation.

AN ADJOURNMENT.

MOTION.

HON. MR. NELSON, in the absence of Mr. McInnes, British Columbia, moved that when this House adjourns to-day it do stand adjourned until Monday, the 22nd instant.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The House, I am sure, will bear in mind that on all these occasions when an adjournment is moved I have stated whether or not I thought the proposed adjournment would interfere with public business. On this occasion I am not able to assent to the motion which my hon. friend has moved, because I apprehend that it might interfere with public business. Besides the ordinary business which is now before the House of Commons it is quite possible or even probable that a Bill will have to be introduced shortly in order to facilitate the negotiations which are going on in England under the guidance of Sir Leonard Tilley, and we do not know at what time the ordinary business of the House will take a stage and we may have bills before us. If my hon. friend would limit his motion to an adjournment from to-morrow (or even to-day if we could get through the business which is before the Railway Committee) until Tuesday of next week, I can make the declaration, which I am always happy to make when I am able to do so, that an adjournment will not interfere with the public business.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I would suggest that the adjournment should be until Wednesday.

HON. MR. READ—Of course we have to take what the Government tell us, but if we judge for ourselves from appearances, it will be some time before we will be required here, if business is to go on as it has been doing in the other House. I notice that 13 clauses in the important Bill which is being passed by the other House have taken 45 days; there are 51 clauses more, and by the rule of progression it will take 200 days more to pass them; so that 30 days of an adjournment would be of little consequence so far as delaying the business of Parliament is concerned. If the leader of the Government could make the adjournment a little longer it will be an advantage to those living at a distance. If two weeks could be taken, I know from a number of gentlemen who have spoken to me on the subject, it would be much better.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—It does not at all follow that each of those clauses will take the exact time mentioned by the hon. gentleman. Some of them may take considerably less, but whether the hon. gentleman's calculation is correct or not this much is certain that the leader of the Government in this House has told us that the services of hon. gentlemen may be required in this Chamber at any moment—he does not specify any particular time, but he has told us that particular business would require us, and that being so, I cannot see how any gentleman who has any regard for the dignity of this Chamber can demand that the adjournment should be longer than the period suggested by the leader of the Government.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I think what has been said by the leader of the Government should guide us in this matter in any decision we may arrive at, and I am sorry to disagree with my hon. friend opposite who suggested that we might adjourn with safety for the time mentioned in the motion. I think we might possibly adjourn for the next six or seven days as there is a holiday this week, and we are only taking two days out of the week by adjourning until Wednesday next. I believe that the Railway Committee has been summoned to meet to-morrow; perhaps the leader of the Government might suggest a way by which the meeting of

that Committee could be held this afternoon, and the adjournment may take place from the adjournment of the House to-day.

HON. MR. POWER—The meeting of the Railway Committee is not a matter of any consequence. I do not suppose that the Government propose to bring the Governor-General down to assent to the Bill this week.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The suggestion is made to me that if an amendment is made to the Bill it will have to go back to the other House.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I generally oppose all adjournments, and this exception would only prove the rule. I have not taken any holiday. I have not had the opportunity of going home, and if we are to have a holiday we might as well have the whole of next week, so that hon. gentlemen who live at a distance can take advantage of it. I am opposed generally to adjournments.

The motion to adjourn until Wednesday, 10th June, at 3 p.m., was agreed to.

THE ADULTERATION BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (W), "An Act respecting the adulteration of foods, drugs and agricultural fertilizers."

In the Committee,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: On the second reading of the Bill my hon. friend from Halifax saw a difficulty in adopting sub-section D of clause 2, inasmuch as, apparently, there is no Fertilizers Act of 1885 in existence. On inquiry I find there is a Bill dealing with that subject now before the other House, which we hope will become law this session.

HON. MR. POWER—But it may not be passed.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—If not we will have to amend this. If it should pass, both these Bills will receive the Royal assent at the same time and there will be no difficulty.

HON. MR. POWER—The Franchise Bill blocks the way in the other House, and there will probably be a number of innocents slaughtered at the end of the session, and the Bill to which my hon. friend refers may not pass. I think it would be better to say "authorized under this Act or any Act respecting agricultural fertilizers."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have no objection to that. I move that the words "the Fertilizers Act, 1885," be struck out and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof, "any Act respecting agricultural fertilizers."

The motion was agreed to.

On sub-section H,

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—There is at present a Bill before the House of Commons, No. 122, referring to the same subject, and there was an Act of last year also referring to the subject, and I perceive that the same defect runs through the whole of these. It allows, in my judgment, far too large a percentage for error in the packages offered for sale. One per cent is allowed for those articles which have borne the Government analysis, and the consequence is a fraudulent manufacturer can make up his mass of manure in a form which will contain one per cent. less of the valuable articles and an equal quantity, in excess, of the less valuable components. I may perhaps explain my meaning more clearly by referring to Peruvian guano which, as every one knows, is a natural product. I find by reference to one of the encyclopædias in the library that in an average sample of Peruvian guano there is about 17 per cent. of ammonia, that the potash forms 3.5 per cent., phosphate of lime 25.12 per cent., and also a small percentage of sand and 20 per cent. of moisture. The values of these respective components are:—

	Per ton
Ammonia	£56 sterling.
Potash	31 "
Soluble phosphate of lime	32 "
Insoluable phosphate of lime	7 "

It is clear from this that a fraudulent manufacturer might, if he pleased, reduce the amount of the valuable ingredients in

the manure by one per cent., and substitute for them the less valuable ingredients; as for instance, the insoluble phosphate of lime, and make a considerable profit on a year's transactions. I will, if hon. gentlemen will permit me, read an extract from Ure's dictionary of arts and manufactures, on the subject of guano.

Mean composition of Peruvian guano, from 78 analyses by Mr. Way, 100 tons contain :—

	Tons.	£	£
Ammonia.....	16.5	@ 56 =	930
Organic matter.....	52	" 1 =	52
Potash.....	3.5	" 31 =	108
Insoluble Phosphate Lime,.	23	" 7 =	161
Soluble Phosphate Lime....	7.	" 32 =	224
			£1,475

Now, it is clear, supposing a manufacturer to be manipulating a mass of artificial manure intended to weigh out 100 tons, he could, if he please, diminish the ammonia worth £56 per ton, the potash worth £31 per ton, and the soluble phosphate of lime worth £32 per ton, and replace them by the insoluble phosphate of lime worth only £7 per ton; and it seems to me that the wording of this clause enables him to do this with impunity, and one might almost say encourages him to do so. I am of opinion that we must either have an efficient law regulating the manufacture and sale of artificial manures, or we would be better without one at all, because it appears to me that this one per cent. of loss is quite unnecessary, simply because the manure is put up in barrels or in bags. In either case there is scarcely any loss by evaporation, and if there is, it is easy to suppose that the loss would be as little in the valuable as in the less valuable ingredients. I mention this to show the House that we are treading on dangerous ground. The subject is one with which few of us are familiar. I will read the analysis of an adulterated sample of Peruvian guano :—

Common salt.....	32.0
Sand	28.0
Sulphate of iron.....	5.2
Phosphate lime.....	4.0
Organic matter from bad guano to give it smell.....	23.3
Moisture	7.5
	100.

Now it is clear to everybody who gives it the slightest reflection, that the common salt and sand were almost entirely valueless, and yet a fraudulent manufacturer was able to introduce and sell an article so adulterated as that.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think my hon. friend has quite caught the meaning of the clause. In the case he mentions the sand and salt would not be parts of the fertilizer specified as necessary by the inspector. It would only be those parts of the fertilizer which are deemed and specified as essential. I do not know what the component parts of guano are, but certainly salt and sand do not enter into the component parts.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Yes.

HON. MR. DEVER—No.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I have examined the subject, and I find that a certain percentage of salt and sand is almost invariably found in guano. The sea birds come away from the sea water to their nests, and naturally they bring with them more or less of the salt water, and this going on for centuries accounts for the presence of salt. In the same way sand is found. It is almost invariably the case, then that salt and sand find their way into Peruvian guano.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Assuming that that is the case, and salt and sand do find their way into the Peruvian guano, no chemist in describing what is essential to guano, would include these. He would describe the guano apart from those incidental components. The clause is—

(*h.*) Every agricultural fertilizer shall be deemed to be "adulterated" within the meaning of this Act, if, when sold, offered or exposed for sale, the chemical analysis thereof shows a deficiency of more than one per cent. of any of the chemical substances, the percentages whereof are required to be specified in the certificate by "*The Fertilizers Act*, 1885," required to be affixed to each barrel, box, sack, or package containing the same, or, if the agricultural fertilizer is in bulk, to be produced to the inspector; or if it contains less than the minimum percentage of such substances required by the said Act to be contained in such fertilizer.

The question is, in analyzing guano would a chemist include salt and sand as "substances required by the said Act to be contained in such fertilizer." If he did not, then the argument of my hon. friend does not apply. We need not confine our view to guano only. Suppose it is an artificial fertilizer, which this Bill deals with more particularly, the chemist, in ascertaining what it contains, certainly would not include any articles which are foreign, therefore he would only put in what was essential to the purity and usefulness of the fertilizer. It must be the absence of one per cent. of what the chemist has said is essential, and it does not seem to me that that is a large percentage.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—It is not one in a hundred pounds, but one in a small percentage of those things—for instance, of the quantity of ammonia or nitrogen in a sample of manure, not one in one hundred, but one in fourteen, or whatever it may be.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Supposing the chemist says it contains fifteen per cent. of this or fifteen per cent. of that, the absence of one per cent. would be sufficient to establish that the article was adulterated. If that is too much, has my hon. friend any suggestion to make? Is one-half of one per cent. the proper thing to make?

HON. MR. POWER—I think there is a certain ambiguity in the wording of the clause. It may mean that it is a deficiency of one per cent. of the proportion of a particular substance which should be there, or it may mean a deficiency of one per cent. of the whole combination. The clause is not clear, and I should venture to suggest to the Minister that after the words "one per cent." he should add "of the proportion;" that would remove all doubt, and it would be perfectly clear that it is one per cent. of the proportion of a particular substance.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think the language used is free from ambiguity. The language is "a deficiency of more than one per cent. of any of the chemical substances, &c."

HON. MR. POWER—One per cent. of what are specified.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—They are all to be specified if they are essential.

HON. MR. POWER—I am not claiming that if the matter were before a court there would be any doubt about its meaning, but here is the case of an ordinary officer who has a table before him showing that a particular agricultural fertilizer which is under consideration should contain 28 per cent. of a particular substance and 16 per cent. of another. The officer would be likely to say that all these percentages added together make 100, and he would be as likely to contrue it that it is one per cent. of the whole amount. What objection can there be to inserting those words "of each proportion?"

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think that it would improve the clause. I do not think the English language can make it more clear than it is now.

HON. MR. WARK—The idea conveyed by the Bill is that it shall not exceed one per cent. of the ingredients referred to.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. member from Marshfield did not seem to construe it in that way.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The fertilizer may lose one per cent. or more in transportation, and I do not think it would be right to restrict it more than the one per cent. proposed in the Bill.

HON. MR. DEVER—In reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Haythorne), I would say he is at fault in his description of the component parts of guano, African sample, by Dr. Ure. It is as follows:—

Saline and organic matter containing 10 per cent. of ammonia...	50.
Water.....	21.5
Phosphate of lime, magnesia, also potash.....	26.
Silica.....	1.
Sulphate of potash and chloride of potassium.....	1.5
	100.

Leibeg and other authorities state that the nature of fertilizers varies with the constitution of the soil. Lime and sand are the best manures for clayey soils, gypsum and marl for sandy ones. But all soils want a proper quantity of vegetable or animal manure, without which it will soon become exhausted and infertile. The principal among this class of manures, are rotten dung and other organic matter, bone dust, nitrate of soda, and sulphate of ammonia. The first is applicable to all soils, the second is especially valuable for wheat, and the third and fourth have been used in various cases with apparent advantage, but require further experiments to establish their precise value. In the application of manures, reference mu t be always had to the intended crop, as certain plants are found to require nourishment of a different description to what is fitted for others, and will grow feebly or not at all when this is absent.

Wheat, for example, will not produce a full kernel on soils destitute of lime.

The food of vegetables, as far as their organic structure is concerned, consists entirely of inorganic compound; and no organized body can serve for the nutrition of vegetables until it has been, by the process of decay, resolved into certain inorganic substances.

These are carbonic acid, water, and ammonia, which are well known to be the final products of putrefaction.

But even when these are supplied to vegetables their growth will not proceed unless certain mineral substances are likewise furnished, in small quantities, either by the soil or the water used to moisten it. Almost every plant when burned leaves ashes, which commonly contain silica, potash, and phosphate of lime; often, also, magnesia, soda, sulphates, and oxide of iron. These mineral bodies appear to be essential to the existence of the vegetable tissues, so that plants will not grow in soils destitute of them however abundantly supplied with carbonic acid, ammonia, and water. The carbon of plants is wholly derived from carbonic acid, which is either absorbed from the atmosphere and rain water by the leaves, or from the moisture and air in the soil by the roots. Its carbon is retained and assimilated with the body of the plant, while its oxygen is given out in the gaseous form, this decomposition being always effected under the action of light at ordinary temperatures.

The hydrogen and oxygen of vegetables, which when combined with carbon, constitute the ligneous, starchy, gummy, saccharine, oily and resinous matters of plants are derived from water, chiefly absorbed by the roots from the soil.

When by an extraordinary supply of any one mineral ingredient, or of ammonia a large crop has been obtained, it is not to be expected that a repetition of the same individual manure next year will produce the same effect. It must be remembered that the unusual crop has exhausted the soil, probably, of all the other mineral ingredients, and that they also must be restored before a second crop can be obtained. The salt most essential to the growth of the potato is the double phosphate of ammonia, and magnesia; that for hay is chiefly phosphate of lime, while for almost all plants potash and ammonia are highly beneficial. By examining the ashes of a thriving plant we discover the mineral ingredients, which must exist in a soil to render it fertile for that plant.

The straw, leaves, &c., of any plant must be the best manure for that plant, since every vegetable extracts from the soil such matters alone as are essential to it. Where these are used no other manures are required. Bone dust supplies the phosphates which have been extracted by crops of grass and corn, and the best return you can give to such soil is the bones of the cattle fed on these crops, which yields ammonia, by putrefaction; guano acts as a source of ammonia, containing much oxalate and urate of ammonia, with some phosphates. Night-soil and urine, especially the latter, are most valuable for the ammonia they yield, as well as for phosphates and potash. Bran is a very valuable manure for potatoes, because it contains ammonia, magnesia and phosphate.

The analysis of manures is not easily performed by inexperienced chemists.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—As I said before, there is another Bill before the House, a clause in which explains how very small a percentage of the more valuable portions of artificial manures is to be

found in any particular package. I refer to clause eleven in the Act respecting agricultural fertilizers, and it relates to the furnishing of a certain tag to be attached to any package of fertilizers. It provides as follows :

The inspector shall not furnish any tag to be attached to any package of fertilizer unless the manufacturer's certificate of analysis is plainly placed upon each parcel or package, or, if the fertilizer is in bulk, shall not deliver any bill of inspection unless such certificate is produced to him, claiming, in the case of an ammoniated superphosphate, that it contains at least six per centum of soluble phosphoric acid, and two per centum of ammonia ; and in the case of any acid phosphate or dissolved bone, that it contains al least ten per centum of available phosphoric acid ; nor shall any such tag be furnished or applied to any package of fertilizer, or bill of inspection, delivered in respect of any fertilizer, that is in a damaged or unmerchantable condition.

Now, that clause fairly demonstrates how very small the percentage of those valuable component parts may be in an artificial fertilizer. If you are to diminish each of these or only one of them by one per cent., you are imposing largely upon the buyer.

HON. MR. WARK—The hon. gentleman has referred to six per cent. ; that is six pounds in 100 pounds, which would be a small percentage of phosphoric acid, and two pounds of ammonia. It would be a small percentage of the whole.

The clause was agreed to.

On the third clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is no change in this clause.

HON. MR. PAQUET (in French)—Will the hon. Minister of Justice be good enough to inform this House if it is the intention of the Government to confine the appointment of analysts to the cities of Quebec and Montreal, in the province of Quebec, under clause three of the Bill now under discussion ? The most frequent adulterations take place, not in the establishment of the wholesale merchant, but in the stores of the retail merchants, who frequently increase the quantity to the prejudice of the quality ; and if, as I do not doubt, the Government also desire the health and the well being of the small towns as well as of the cities, they will see that a larger number of analysts are appointed. Their greater proximity to the places where those who adulterate operate, will provide more surely for the discovery and punishment of certain vendors of liquor, and will prevent this law from becoming a dead letter, as was the case with the previous one.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL (in French)—I will consult the Department of Inland Revenue, and will inform the hon. gentleman on a future occasion.

On the 9th clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The words that are added in this clause are the words in the middle of the clause "except in specific cases respecting which provision is made by order of the Governor-in-Council," and the words "if required by him so to do."

HON. MR. POWER—What is the object of the Order-in-Council ?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The clause provides that the officer purchasing any article with the intention of submitting it to be analyzed, shall, after the purchase has been completed, forthwith notify the seller or his agent selling the article, of his intention to have the same analyzed by the public analyst, and shall divide the article into three parts, to be then and there separated, and each part to be marked and sealed up or fastened up, as its nature permits, and so on. That has been found sometimes inconvenient, and sometimes to the damage and disadvantage of the person who desired the thing to be analyzed, and it is thought in some cases it would be better not to require that the article be divided into three parts and each part marked and sealed up or fastened up and so on.

The clause was agreed to.

On the 2nd sub-section,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Subsection two provides for the transmission of parts for analysis ; that he shall trans-

mit another of such parts to the Minister of Inland Revenue for submission to the chief analysist in case of appeal; and the remaining part to the analysist for the district within which the samples were taken, unless otherwise directed by the Minister of Inland Revenue.

HON. MR. POWER—Supposing that under this Order-in-Council the article is not divided into three parts, how are you going to proceed if the party appeals? Because the sub-section—that is clause 9—goes on to provide only for a case where it is so separated, each part shall be marked or sealed up or fastened up if required by him so to do. Then it provides, "he shall transmit another of such parts to the Minister of Inland Revenue for submission to the chief analyst in case of appeal, and shall submit the remaining part to the analyst for the district within which the samples were taken unless otherwise directed by the Minister of Inland Revenue." Now, if there is no separation into parts those things cannot be done.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman will see the words added in the 9th clause, "except in specific cases respecting which provision is made by Order-in-Council." That provision includes all this.

The sub-section was agreed to.

On the 32nd clause.

HON. MR. POWER—The 32nd clause provides that this Act shall come into force upon the first day of July, 1885. Is the Minister sure that this Bill will be assented to before the first July?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Can my hon. friend tell me? He is in the secrets of the Opposition?

HON. MR. POWER—I think, as we are only dealing with it here for the first time in the beginning of June, some later period should be provided for the Act coming into force.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Say the first of January, 1886. I hope my hon. friend from Halifax is of opinion that that will give time enough to the Opposition!

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE, from the Committee, reported the Bill with several amendments, which were concurred in.

HON. MR. POWER—I would ask the Minister of Justice if he would consider that question about the percentage before the third reading?

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—I will take care that the matter is considered, and I will inform the hon. gentlemen at another time, as I propose to reply to the question of the hon. gentleman from La Valliere when the House meets again and explain whether there are to be more than the present number of analysts appointed.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

THE SEWERAGE AND VENTILATION OF THE SENATE BUILDING.

HON. MR. POWER—Before the adjournment is moved, there is a matter to which, I think, some little attention might be devoted during the adjournment, and if not then, during the recess at any rate, that is, the sewerage of these buildings. I have not been very much impressed with it heretofore, but during the present session I have been very much struck with the fact that the drainage in connection with some parts of the building is exceedingly bad, and it is a matter that deserves some attention. I think there are other members whose experience has been the same as my own. I know that in room No. 10 the atmosphere when the door is closed for a short time, is simply abominable, and it is evident that the sink in the room connects in some way with the sewer or some other objectionable place, from which there is an escape of foul gases. It is desirable that we should live as long as we can. They may abolish the Senate, but I do

not think that the proper way to abolish us is by asphyxiation, or with typhoid fever.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I am very glad that my hon. friend has called attention to this subject. I happened to-day to enter one of the rooms with some strangers while showing them through the House, and I was repelled by the noisome odor that came out of that room. It was empty at the time, and I could not ask the hon. gentlemen who occupy that room whether the foul atmosphere was only momentary or whether it remained there all the time. The room I refer to is No. 8. There must be some connection there with the sewer, and the gas comes into the room. I was there a moment this afternoon, and I asked the brother of the chief messenger to go into the room and see if he could discover anything, but he could not find any cause for the foul atmosphere. This is a matter that requires immediate attention. The foul atmosphere emenates from under that part of the House, and there is undoubtedly a break in the sewerage somewhere.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—My hon. friend from Niagara called my attention to this matter to-day when I came into the room No. 8. The atmosphere there is so bad that a person who remains long in it is in danger of contracting typhoid fever.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B.C.)—There is no doubt that ever since the frost went out of the ground there has been a very bad atmosphere in the House. I told a messenger to send the engineer to look after it but he has not yet done so.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—I have found the ventilation so bad that I made up my mind some time ago that if the weather got hot and the ventilation of this building was not improved, I would run away. I am alone in my room, and without inconvenience to any other person I can keep my window open, and even then I feel it difficult to keep the atmosphere in that room in a proper condition. It is observable even in the corridors. If you go out into the fresh air to take exercise and then come into this room at any time you will find that the air is vitiated to a certain extent. If we are to be kept here during the summer, those who remain will suffer from this cause unless something is done to improve the ventilation.

HON. MR. DEVER—No doubt there is a break of some kind in the sewerage on the eastern side of the building, and I think it is from one of two causes—either the sewer is broken by the frost in the winter time, or the draught from the ventilation duct being open, the wind, when from a certain direction, blows the vitiated air back into the House. I have had some experience of the difficulty in draining a house properly, and I know that where there is the best drainage, unless there is a trap at the end of the sewer, the wind will at times blow the foul air back into the house. What improvement can be made in this case I am not prepared to say, unless the floors on the rooms on the eastern side are taken up, for I am almost certain that the *terra cotta* pipe is broken there somewhere. It will require investigation by a man who thoroughly understands those things before it can be remedied.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B. C.)—I am very glad that this matter has been brought before the notice of this House. When I went into room No. 8 to-day the atmosphere was very offensive, and it continued to be so during the whole time I remained there although the windows were up. Unless something is done to improve the sewerage and ventilation we cannot occupy that room any longer.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think we are all indebted to my hon. friend for bringing the matter before the House. This afternoon I will speak to the Minister of Public Works, and I am quite sure that most thorough measures will be taken to remedy the evil complained of. I would suggest that the House might adjourn during pleasure, and the Railway Committee can meet and consider the only Bill remaining. The House could then take it up at once and dispose of it, and there would be no time lost by the adjournment. I move that the House adjourn during pleasure.

The motion was agreed to.

At 5.15 p.m. the House was resumed.

FORT McLEOD RANCHE TELEGRAPH CO'S. BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. MR. PLUMB, from the Committee on Railways, Telegraphs and Harbors, reported Bill (80), "An Act to incorporate the Fort McLeod Ranche Telegraph Company," with amendments, which he explained were very trifling.

HON. MR. GIRARD, moved that the amendments be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was then read the third time and passed.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—In moving the adjournment of the House, I am happy to say that there is no business before the House or any of its committees.

The Senate adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Wednesday, June 10th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

AMENDMENT RECEDED FROM.

The following message was received from the House of Commons:—

House of Commons,
Tuesday, 9th June, 1885.

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honors that this House agrees to the first and second of their amendments to the Bill (No. 31) intituled: "An Act to amend and consolidate the Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883 "and 1884," and disagrees to their third amendment for the following reason: Because the practice of allowing candidates to get copies of their examination papers, after such examinations, would be unusual and contrary to rules adopted in universities and other bodies where similar examinations are required.

Ordered, That the Clerk do carry the said message to the Senate.

Attest,
J. G. BOURINOT,
Clerk of the Commons.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This amendment, as described in the report, was for the purpose of enabling candidates who had submitted to examination to obtain copies of their answers to questions, and the House of Commons have disagreed to the amendment for the reasons mentioned in the report. It does not seem to me that it is an amendment which we should insist upon, inasmuch as the candidates, if they see fit, can take copies of their answers before they put them in, or can make other arrangements to obtain them. I therefore move that this House do not insist upon their third amendment to the said Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, June 11th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

PATENTS FOR LANDS IN MANITOBA

MOTION.

HON. MR. GUEVREMONT (in French) moved—

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General; praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a copy of the patent issued by the Department of the Interior for lot number 133, in the Parish of St. Agathe, in the Province of Manitoba, to Mrs. Annie Lonsdale, on the 31st October, 1881.

He said—In making this motion I intended to have addressed the House on the subject to which it refers, but I will content myself for the present with merely

moving for the papers. When they are before the House I will refer to the subject again.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The Government have no objection to the Address.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (117), "An Act respecting the Commercial Bank of Windsor." (Hon. Sir Alex. Campbell).

Bill (126), "An Act to provide for the fitting representation of Canada at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition to be held in London in the year 1886." (Hon. Sir Alex. Campbell).

Bill (105), "An Act respecting the Bank of British Columbia." (Hon. Sir Alex. Campbell).

Bill (133), "An Act further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882." (Hon. Sir Alex. Campbell).

Bill (119), "An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the inspection of Gas and Gas Metres." (Hon. Sir Alex. Campbell).

AN ADJOURNMENT.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—Before the adjournment of the House I beg to observe that there is nothing on the paper for to-morrow but a question proposed by the hon. member from British Columbia (Mr. McInnes). We have work for Monday, but not sooner. I suppose there can be no objection to an adjournment till then. I therefore move that when this House adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until Monday.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 3.30 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Monday, June 15th, 1885.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

ENGINE HOUSE AT PORT MOODY.

INQUIRY.

HON. MR. McINNES (B.C.) enquired:

"Is the Government going to build a Railway Engine House at Port Moody? If so, when will the contract be awarded and the building completed?"

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is the intention of the Government to build an Engine House on that part of the road; but whether at Port Moody or some part lower down, the Government have not yet decided. It will rest very much on the advice they will receive from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

PROOF OF ENTRIES IN BOOKS OF ACCOUNT KEPT BY OFFICERS OF THE CROWN, BILL.

COMMONS AMENDMENTS.

A message was received from the House of Commons, returning Bill (M), "An Act respecting Proof of Entries in Books kept by Officers of the Crown," with certain amendments.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The amendments are in furtherance of the object of the Bill. It was thought in the other branch of the legislature that there was a want of perspicuity in some of the expressions, leaving it doubtful which officer of the department was to make the oath; and it seemed to them that the oath was required. The amendments are merely to make it more clear by whom the oath is to be made. I move that the amendments be concurred in.

HON. MR. POWER—I presume that the amendments are all in the proper direction, but not having the Bill before me I cannot tell what the exact nature of

the amendments is, and I presume that other members are in the same position. It might be as well to have the amendments printed so that we would understand them better, and that they be taken into consideration to-morrow.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have no objection to that; I move that the amendments be taken into consideration to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC LOAN BILL.

SECOND READING.

A message was received from the Commons with Bill (145), "An Act to authorize the raising by way of loan certain sums of money for the public service."

The Bill was read the first time.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I beg to move that the 41st rule of this House be suspended, so far as it relates to this Bill, and that the Bill be read the second time, at length, at the table.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. Minister should give some reason for such an unusual step as the suspension of the 41st rule.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I was just going to do so.

HON. MR. POWER—I think the explanation should have come from the Minister when he moved the suspension of the rule.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I could not very well give an explanation, because I had moved the second reading of the Bill as well as the suspension of the rule, and my hon. friend knows that the ordinary usage of the House is that the motion is put from the chair before being spoken to.

HON. MR. POWER—Then the hon. member was guilty of an irregularity in moving two motions at once.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The object of the Bill is to authorize the raising by loan of $30,000,000, and the object in asking the House to pass it at once is that negotiations are now in progress in London, and it is necessary in preparing the debentures which are to be issued that the title of the Bill and the terms should be recited to some extent. A message has been received from Sir Leonard Tilley and the agents in London, requesting that the Bill might be passed as soon as possible. The House will, no doubt, desire to know the application of the money to be raised by this Bill. The following is the memorandum given to me by the Finance Department :—

Temporary loans in London and Canada, to be repaid	$15,819,671
C. P. R. loan and subsidy..	5,750,000
Capital expenditure, 1885-86, and supplementary estimate 1884-5 and 1885-6..	6,979,663
Insurrection in the North-west	4,000,000
Probable expenditure on account railway subsidies, 46 Vic. and 47 Vic., and also Short Line Railway..	2,500,000
	$35,049,334

It is for the purpose of enabling the Government to meet these sums that it is proposed to make this loan. As the negotiations have proceeded and as the Finance Minister is anxious that this power should be given to the Government now, for the object which I have mentioned, I hope the House will allow the Bill to be read the second time to-day.

HON. MR. WARK—How will the other $5,000,000 be provided?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Out of the treasury without reference to this particular loan.

HON. MR. WARK—How much will the whole debt be with this addition?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The net debt will be about $191,000,000, and the gross debt $258,000,000

HON. MR. SCOTT—Including this amount?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Including a portion of this

HON. MR. SCOTT—What portion?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The portion due in Canada and London, $15,819,000. The statement made the other day in the House of Commons was that the net debt was about $191,000,000, and the gross debt $258,000,000. I should think, speaking without any special knowledge of the matter, that with the exception of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the insurrection in the North-West, the railway subsidies not yet used, and the supplementary estimates, the whole of this is included in the debt, which was said, the other day, to be the amount I have mentioned.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I assume that the subject will come before Parliament in another shape, and we will then have an opportunity of discussing it; my hon. friend wishes to pass this Bill at once, before we have any opportunity of considering it. This, I understand, also is apart from the negotiation which has just been completed in London, converting our five per cents into four per cents?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Will my hon. friend say whether this covers the whole amount of the proposed loan which the Government contemplate before Parliament rises—the whole amount to be raised on capital account? Because, under certain Acts of Parliament the Government have special borrowing powers outside of that. I do not understand that those borrowing powers have been exhausted, and therefore I wish to ask whether it is proposed to exceed the specific power given in this Bill, and the Government will avail itself of the further borrowing powers.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I cannot speak with any certainty, but I understand that this present Bill covers the whole amount which the Government now expect to borrow. However, I do not speak with the certainty of a financial man upon it.

HON. MR. WARK—I think the resolution in the House of Commons specified that this was to be in addition to other sums authorized to be borrowed.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—It appears to me a very extraordinary procedure to ask Parliament to give its assent to a Bill which we have not seen. We have simply heard a sort of indistinct explanation from the leader of this House which I have not been able to catch. I can only say that if the Senate agrees to give its sanction to a Bill of such a character as this, giving borrowing powers to the Government to the extent of $35,000,000 without even seeing the Bill, it is an instance of the manner in which the Government treat Parliament and this House especially. In a very short time the country will begin to see that we are reaping the fruits of the administration of a profligate government. In former days, if the question of $1,000,000 or $5,000,000 came up, it always engaged the earnest attention of the House, but who can sanction and uphold the cool manner in which the leader of this House now introduces a Bill of such significance and asks that it be read the second time before it has been distributed? Why should we give borrowing powers to a government which are going on as the present Government are doing, without knowing for what purposes such a colossal sum is asked? With regard to the North-West we know that simply through their misrule they have brought untold obligations upon the country. We have already had to vote $1,700,000, and they ask now that this amount should be extended to $4,000,000, which will not cover the total expense of the outbreak and all its consequences. The action of the Dominion Parliament at this moment is simply a blind acquiesence in the acts of one man. That political leader, namely the First Minister of the Crown, obtained from this country in 1878 an overwhelming majority when he appealed to the electors. He obtained then the suffrages of the people upon the question of a National Policy, and he afterwards brought in his gerrymandering Bill, through which he obtained a further lease of power. He has to-day a commanding majority in the House of Commons, and from the amiable disposition

of the members of this august body, who are not disposed to call in question his wisdom or prudence, we are now from a blind acquiesence in the acts of that Minister sanctioning what is wrong, and you cannot take up a journal without observing the letters of earnest men, leading merchants and bankers of the country, addressed to the Press of the country expressing their alarm and anxiety as to the condition of our public affairs. Parliament seems to think it has no duty to discharge but to acquiesce in all the acts of that one man. I, myself, had implicit confidence in the judgment of that Minister until I saw that he was habitually trampling under vested rights and entering upon wild schemes of expenditure which must soon arouse widespread discontent. What, I may ask, caused the downfall of the Gladstone government but the necessity of raising additional revenue on beer and spirits in order to equalize expenditure and revenue? And we now find our own Government increasing the liabilities of the country until there will be a widespread discontent, and perhaps something worse. I take this occasion to warn the Government of the day that Confederation stands upon no solid basis. We have had one insurrection in the North-West, and the Conservative party may pretend to laugh and sneer at the Farmers' Union of the North-West, and to say that they are simply inspired by the Grit party. I have taken the trouble to inform myself respecting this, and I am assured by settlers from the North-West that the Farmers' Union embraces some of the leading men in that country. In British Columbia we have observed discontent because the Government have found it necessary to impose stampage dues on timber and enforce other regulations to which the people object. And are the two branches of parliament prepared to go on acquiescing in the misguided action of one man, adding millions of dollars to the public debt, until there is a danger of breaking up confederation? I raise my humble voice against such a course, and I hope the hon. gentlemen will let the Bill stand over till to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD—There is nothing unusual in the course recommended by the Minister of Justice with respect to this Bill, nor is it extraordinary. This Bill is a money Bill. It has received the concurrence of the House of Commons after discussion. It has come up here and we cannot amend it, and we do not want delays. We must either give our consent to it or throw it out altogether. I think the Senate will hesitate before they throw out the Bill, and amend it they cannot. Under the circumstances, the hon. Minister has given sufficient reason to show that the Senate should concur in the measure inasmuch as negotiations for a loan are going on, and it is necessary that the terms of the Bill should be communicated to the Finance Minister who is now in London. The course of the Minister of Justice is not an unusual one, and I think the Senate should concur in it without further discussion.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I do not agree with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. It is perfectly true that the Senate cannot amend the Bill, nor is at all probable that they will throw it out, and for that reason there is no hurry. The Minister of Justice knows as well now as if the Bill had passed, that it will pass this House without any alteration; consequently any information that is necessary to send to London respecting the form of the Bill can be sent now as well as after the passing of the measure. Although this House cannot alter or amend a money bill, and is not likely to throw it out, still we have heretofore exercised the right of discussing measures of this character. I remember that some years ago very long discussions upon the financial condition of the country were carried on in this chamber, and, as we have not been doing a great deal for some time past, this is one of those subjects upon which hon. gentlemen could very well make their voices heard. For myself I must express a feeling of melancholy and disappointment to think that after all the surpluses of the past years, of which the hon. Minister who is not now in his place has been very fond of boasting, we are called upon to authorize the borrowing of some $35,000,000, to pay off the floating debt. Under the circumstances it would only be expected that the Minister of Justice in asking the concurrence of the House in a Bill of such a very serious character as

this should have entered into a little more detail as to why it was necessary and as to the objects of the different loans which are embodied in the Bill. The Minister has admitted that he is not at present in possession of sufficient information to answer the questions that have already been asked him in connection with it. Therefore, no harm can befall the public service in any way by an adherence to the usual forms of Parliamentary rule ; and the second reading ought to be postponed until to-morrow. I may say for one, that I shall not offer, as long as there is time given to read the Bill, and to understand its full import, any objection to the other stages of the Bill being taken in one day. It is unreasonable on the part of the Government to ask to push this Bill through in this way, seeing that they have known, with respect to the bulk of the money proposed to be borrowed under this Bill, from the beginning of the session, that it would be required ; and now, after we have been sitting for five months, the Government come down and tell us that this measure, which they might have introduced at any time this session, must be rushed through the House immediately after being introduced. I think it is an extraordinary position for the Government to take. I am not, as the hon. Minister knows, given to raising unnecessary technical objections ; but unless the Minister agrees to give us time to read the Bill and consider its import before undertaking to push it to its final stage, I shall be obliged to object to the suspension of the rule. If the hon. Minister will say that he will postpone the third reading until to-morrow, and that anything we have to say on the Bill can be said then, and that he will then be prepared to make any explanations that are necessary, I shall withdraw my objection.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have no objection to taking the third reading to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time at length at the Table.

HON. MR. WARK—Will the Minister of Justice be able to inform the House to-morrow how much unborrowed money referred to in that Bill may be added to the $30,000,000 when borrowing ?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—As far as I know it is only to the extent of thirty or thirty-five millions that it is intended to borrow under the additional power the Government may have. I will ascertain and inform the House to-morrow.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Bill (122), "An Act respecting agricultural fertilizers." (Hon. Sir Alex. Campbell.)

COMMERCIAL BANK OF WINDSOR BILL.

SECOND READING

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (117), "An Act respecting the Commercial Bank of Windsor." He said : The Commercial Bank of Windsor, in Nova Scotia, is a bank that was doing business under a local charter. Their charter was to expire during the present year, and attention was thus drawn to the subject. It turned out that they had applied to the Treasury Board by special resolution in 1875, to become incorporated under the terms of the General Banking Act, which would extend their charter until 1891, and they expressed their desire to conform to those terms. Their memorial to that effect went to the Treasury Board in 1875, and was adopted there, and the proceedings under the statute were authorized to be taken. Those proceedings included the publication in the *Canada Gazette* of the fact that the bank had so applied, and that the Treasury Board had agreed to their application, and that it was to be carried into effect. This publication in the *Gazette*, through some accident, never took place. The following resolution was passed by the directors of the bank on the 19th of February, 1875 :

"Whereas the time has arrived when it is desirable to increase the capital of this bank, and whereas the stockholders have given the directors authority to do so to the extent of $500,000.

Therefore resolved that the cashier is hereby authorized to apply to the Treasury Board for a charter under the Dominion

Banking Act with power to increase the capital to $500,000, by issuing 7,500 new shares of $40 each, or $300,000."

This application was sent to the Treasury Board, and the following minute was made of it there :—

"Read applications from Walter Lawson, cashier of the Commercial Bank of Windsor, asking for a bank certificate to issue as soon as $500,000 is subscribed. The Board order that certificate be issued as soon as satisfactory evidence is received in accordance with the Act, 34th Vic., cap. 5."

The $500,000 was subscribed, and the certificate was issued to the bank on the 22nd May, 1885 ; but by some accident it was never published in the Official *Gazette*, as required by section 73 of the Banking Act, and it was not amongst those banks whose charters were extended by 43 Vic., cap. 22. This Bill is to remedy that omission, and to declare that all contracts and agreements, entered into by the bank in the meantime, shall be valid and effectual, and to extend the charter of the bank, in conformity with what would have been done had the regular proceedings been taken at the time mentioned—that is, up to 1891

HON. MR. POWER—Who is to give this notice that is required by the 73rd section of the Banking Act ?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL — I might mention to my hon. friend from Halifax, who asks whose fault it was that this notice was not published, that it was the fault of the officers of the Treasury Board, and I might add that it was during the time of the late Government.

HON. MR. POWER—It is very kind of the Minister to give that information unasked. The reason I asked the question is, I thought that if it had been through any omission on the part of the Company there might be some question as to their right to get the Bill without discussion ; but as long as the mistake was made by the officers of the Government, the Company are entitled to their charter. I am glad all the mistakes are not made by the present Government

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION BILL

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (126), "An Act to provide for the fitting representation of Canada at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, to be held in London in the year 1886."

He said :—When it was proposed in England to undertake a Colonial and Indian Exhibition in London, a circular was sent to the various colonies informing them that India had agreed to guarantee a certain amount, £20,000, and asking if they would join in the guarantee so as to swell the amount from £20,000 to £50,000, and this Bill is to authorize us to do our part of the request,and to guarantee £10,000 of the £50,000, that would be £30,000 of the amount, and the other colonies would make up the other £20,000. The money so guaranteed is to be held to meet any sum by which the intended exhibition may fall short of being self-supporting. In the past those exhibitions have not been attended with loss, and there is no idea that it will be on this occasion. On the contrary it is expected that it will be a great success, and that it will be an exhibition of great interest and importance to the colonies, and to Canada among them. It is proposed to exhibit the growth of the colonies and of India, and to show from actual products to the eyes of all that go there the extent to which progress has been made in the colonies, and in that way it will bring the products of this country under the notice of a great many people who take an interest in the colonies and in India, and also of the general public. It seemed to us to be an exhibition particularly desirable, and one particularly in our interests, and we thought that we were right in saying we would present to Parliament a Bill for the purpose of enabling us to guarantee to the extent of £10,000, should there be a loss, and that we should contribute to make up that loss, in proportion to the extent of our guarantee.

HON. MR. SCOTT—There is no doubt that an exhibition of this character will

have its advantages, provided the colonies send forward their exhibits; and I should like very much to know, and I am sure the country would like to know, whether the Government has any policy in reference to the line they propose to adopt towards aiding the exhibitors who propose to exhibit in London. We know that unless it is stimulated by the Administration, exhibitors are very slow to incur the very large expense that will necessarily fall upon them to send their goods to so remote a point as London. I think on former occasions a grant was made from the public chest towards reducing the large outlay that necessarily falls on the exhibitors if they have got to bear the whole amount themselves, and therefore they will require to know a year in advance, if the Canadian section is to be a success. It will only be a success by Canadians taking a large interest in it. That interest will only develop under the stimulus of assistance. We will not find that any large number of exhibitors from Canada will be induced to send agents there and incur large expense, unless the country is prepared to assist; and as the Government has proposed to guarantee $50,000, they will no doubt arrive at a policy on that point before asking Parliament to guarantee so large a sum. If Canada is not going to participate in it, we ought not to join in the guarantee; and if we join in the guarantee we ought to make the most out of it, and we can only do so by liberal assistance being given to the promoters, and by its being known at least a year in advance that that assistance will be rendered by the Government.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The Government have adopted a policy with reference to this matter, and we are now pursuing that policy as far as we have been enabled to do up to this time. It is proposed to assist, I cannot say in what direction, or to what extent, to assist and stimulate the exhibition, and the sending of products from this country as far as we can do so. The steps already taken are for the purpose of procuring information. Agents have already been employed who are visiting or will shortly visit the various provinces of the Dominion for the purpose of getting together information as to what the transmission, from each particular province would probably be, and in what way assistance could best and most advantageously be given to them. We propose as far as we can to make the exhibition a successful one, and hope that it may be of more use to the colony than ordinary exhibitions have been. Being an intercolonial one, and showing side by side the products of the different colonies of the empire, it will not only be a great advantage to the empire, but will be a stimulus to the colonies, and will have a tendency to bring them into closer relation with one another, and with the Mother country. We do propose, as far as the Government is concerned, to give such assistance—doing it carefully—as will tend as far as it can to make the exhibition a successful one.

HON. MR. POWER—I hope the Government will not fail to send on their own behalf one very rare and curious exhibit. It will be their duty to send over a copy of the Franchise Bill. It is something the like of which no other colony, or no other part of the Empire, or in fact no other country in the world will be able to produce or exhibit.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Perhaps my hon. friend from Halifax will volunteer to go over and explain it.

HON. MR. DEVER — A greater curiosity still would be to send over the Opposition to it!

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Perhaps at some future stage of the Bill the Minister will be able to explain more clearly what form the assistance will take. In the Province of Prince Edward Island an Advisory Board has already been appointed. It would greatly strengthen the hands of those who form that Board to be made aware, at as early a period as possible, of the fact that the expenses they, or the province may incur, will be met from the Dominion Treasury. It is important that this should be known at as early a date as possible, because extra pains and attention will be paid by producers of all kinds to see that what they have to exhibit is of first-class quality, and to insure that the element of time is all important. I therefore suggest to the hon. gentleman whether at a future

stage of the Bill he could not give us more complete information than he has been able to give us to-day

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I will endeavor to do so, but I am afraid that I cannot, because we are unable to make up our minds as to the precise course which we shall pursue with regard to assistance, until we get this information together, but it may be that the Minister of Finance will be able to give further information. I will make inquiry, and I shall be very glad to give further information, if I can do so, at some future stage of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

BANK OF BRITISH COLUMBIA BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (105), "An Act respecting the Bank of British Columbia." He said: The Bank of British Columbia is a bank doing business under a royal charter in the province of British Columbia. Its original charter was granted to it in 1862. A supplementary charter was granted in 1865, and these charters gave them power to do business until 1883. In 1883, a supplemental charter was granted to them for a year, and in 1884 a still further supplemental charter dated 27th May in that year. This last charter enabled them to do business for ten years, but to do it subject to the general banking law of the colony in which the business was being carried on. That was the first time that the clause was introduced in their charters, and it was introduced in deference to our general Banking Act. That clause it is now proposed to avail of by declaring what clauses of the Banking Act they shall be subject to, and what clauses they shall be exempt from. The clauses they are to be subject to relate to the general conduct of banking business: those providing for returns, the limit of circulation (which is not to exceed the amount of the unimpaired paid-up capital), the denomination of notes allowed to be issued, and the payment thereof in case of insolvency, dividends, reserves, powers of the bank in holding real estate, etc., and the penalties for the breach of all provisions made applicable to the bank, but the internal regulations are not touched. The provisions made applicable to the Bank of British North America are made applicable to this bank, and for the purpose of the Act Victoria is made the head office of the bank. The charter of the bank provides for a double liability of the shareholders in case of the winding up of the bank. The Bank of British North America has only a single liability. The Bill has been submitted to the authorities of the Bank in England, and has been approved of by them.

The internal regulations relate to the opening of books of subscription, the transfers and transmission of shares, the payment therefor, voting of shareholders powers of shareholders to regulate the management and administration of the bank, such as the remuneration of the president, the qualification of directors, election of directors, &c., special general meetings, board of directors, their quorum and general powers so far as the management of the bank is concerned, and making and enforcement of calls the statements to be laid before the general meeting of the shareholders, the inspection of books and the declaring of dividends, except that in the last case they cannot declare any dividend exceeding eight per cent. unless rest equals 20 per cent. of paid up capital. These things are provided for by the charter of the bank.

The House will see the general nature of the provisions to which it is proposed to make them subject, and the general nature of the provisions which it is proposed to exempt them from.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B.C.)—I do not rise to oppose the Bill, but merely to express my regret that in the first clause it provides that no bills shall be issued for a less sum than $5 and the multiples of $5. Unfortunately in British Columbia, owing to our sparse population, we have very few banks, and very few money order post-offices. The consequence is if this Bill becomes law, it will be very difficult indeed to transmit moneys from one portion of the province to another. Up to the

present time very few $1 and $2 Dominion bank notes have found their way there, and if this clause is enforced, I am afraid it will entail very great hardship on many people living in the outlying districts of the province.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Have they been issuing small notes?

HON. MR. McINNES (B. C.)—Yes, until a very few years ago. I should like very much indeed, if it did not interfere with the general object of the Bill, that they should be authorized to issue notes from one dollar up.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—The bank of its own accord ceased to issue small notes some years ago

HON. MR. McINNES (B C)—I am aware of that, but it nevertheless leaves the people of the province in a very awkward position in transmitting money.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—I do not think so. They have $2 notes.

HON. MR. McINNES—Very few.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is no divergence of opinion between the Bank and the Government. They abandoned issuing small notes, and they have no disposition to resume issuing them.

HON. MR. McINNES—I am very sorry to hear it.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

THE TROOPS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

ENQUIRY.

HON. MR. POWER—Before the House adjourns I should like to ask the Minister if he would be kind enough, or if he will be in a position at the third reading of the Loan Bill to-morrow, to give the House some information as to the probable time when the Government will begin to withdraw the troops from the North-West, and the rate at which they will be withdrawn. I think it was stated in the other Chamber that the expense of keeping the troops up there is about half a million dollars a month, and consequently if they are going to remain there for some indefinite time, the expenditure will be very considerably increased, It is a matter which is germane to the Bill, and I think the country will be anxious to know how long the troops will be kept in the field.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I will be able to give information about it to-morrow, I have no doubt. It is the intention of the Government to withdraw the troops as soon as possible. Arrangements are now being discussed as to the degree and how rapidly they can be withdrawn.

The Senate adjourned at 4.15 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Tuesday, June 16th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

PUBLIC LOAN BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of Bill (145), "An Act to authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the Public Service." He said: In moving the third reading of this Bill I will take occasion to make the replies which I promised to give with reference to the inquiries made by two members of the House yesterday. My hon. friend from New Brunswick (Mr. Wark) is desirous of knowing whether any of the existing powers of borrowing were intended to be availed of by the Government in addition to the $30,000,000 mentioned in this Bill, and I stated that the intention of the Government was to limit itself to the borrowing powers given in this Bill, and that is the intention of the Government. The additional powers which

are in force, and which might be availed of if the Government thought proper so to do, are to be found in the Statutes of 1884, chap. 2, and if my hon. friend will look at that Statute he will find there a number of powers given to borrow, but they are principally for specific purposes, as, for instance: For the Intercolonial Railway, so much; for opening communication with and for the administration of the Government in the Northwest, so much; for improvement of the River St. Lawrence, so much; for Quebec harbor, so much; Quebec graving dock, so much; Canadian Pacific Railway, so much; Canals, so much; Savings Banks, so much, etc. Then certain sums are deducted, leaving the balance which would seem to be available for the Government for the various purposes of the Bill, twenty-two millions odd; but I am told the balance remaining unborrowed on these powers for general purposes is under five millions; but it is not intended that the Government shall avail itself of those borrowing powers even for the $5,000,000 as far as we know. We do not abandon the power, nor do we avail ourselves of it. Then the hon. member from Halifax (Mr. Power) desired to know, with reference to the probable expenditure in the North-West to come out of the $4,000,000 mentioned in this Bill, when the troops were likely to be withdrawn. I have seen the Minister of Militia on that point, and he is in communication with the general in command of the forces up there, to see how soon, and how quickly, the troops can be withdrawn. It is the desire of the Minister, and of the Government, that they should be withdrawn as soon as possible. In the absence of communications from the general in command, the Minister of Militia is of opinion that it can be done at an early date, but he cannot say when until he hears from the general. I think these are the only two questions asked with reference to this Bill.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The Bill will, no doubt, be read the third time, and I assume it will be our duty to allow it to be read to meet the emergencies which the Government suggest are so important. I noticed in the other House the Bill was very little discussed, owing to the fact that the Government needed the authority to complete the loan at an early date. I find, from returns brought down in the other Chamber that the greater part of the money mentioned in this Bill has been actually expended. It is not to borrow money to expend, but to recoup the Government for money already expended. I notice that the largest item is to cover $4,400,000 already borrowed in this country, and $11,400,000 already borrowed in London.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I mentioned that yesterday.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Therefore, the larger portion of the loan has really been expended. The other portion of it is for the payment of sums that Parliament has already authorized, and public works that are now going on, for which, no doubt, this money has been largely anticipated. So, no doubt, it is really to recoup money which has actually been expended. I do not propose to go into any lengthened detail of the public debt of Canada at this moment, but still in passing a bill of this kind which adds $30,000,000 to the public debt of the country, it may not be inappropriate or inopportune to draw attention to the increased public debt of this country, and to ask ourselves whether it can go on in the ratio at which it has been accumulating for the last few years with anything like safety to the country. I will draw attention to a few of the salient leaps of this public debt without going into details. Our net debt, as it stood the year after Confederation, 1867-68, was $75,750,000, in round figures. That debt had risen at the end of 1884, as I find by the public accounts which are under my hand here, to $182,161,850. That was the net debt; that was after crediting the gross debt with some $60,000,000 assets. We may add this year to that amount $30,000,000, making the net debt at the end of this year $212,161,850. But the most startling part of it is that while in the last two or three years, since the increased duties on our imports have forced up the public revenue of this country to nearly one-third of what it had ordinarily reached in former years under the lower tariff, yet in the face of that, with the surpluses the

Government have been able to boast of in consequence of those increased duties, we have added in two years $54,000,000 to our debt. The debt of 1884 exceeded the debt in 1883 by $24,000,000, and we now add $30,000,000, which two sums make $54,000,000 in two years. I am quite aware that a large portion of that necessarily is chargeable to the Canadian Pacific Railway to which this country has committed itself, and to the rapid mode in which that line is being constructed; but still that does not explain anything like the full extent of that huge indebtedness. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not in the last two years spent anything like the figures I have quoted. Then what is the cause of this extraordinary outflow of the public money in the direction of public works? Simply we have drifted into a system of government by compromise. Even with a very strong government—the strongest we have had in Canada in a great many years—with the huge majority which they possess in both Chambers, they are unable to carry out any legitimate policy they may adopt without introducing an omnibus measure, giving by way of bribes to different parts of this country, large sums of money in order to induce members from those sections to support the particular policy that the Government for the moment think they are bound to adopt. I say that is an unhealthy condition of things, and one deeply to be deplored. It is a condition of things which must sooner or later land us in bankruptcy unless it is stopped. With a weak government depending on a majority of half a dozen supporters, as I have known governments in this country to be situated in years gone by, there might have been some palliation for such a course. They might have said that it was necessary in order to mantain the administration in power, though I think it is contrary to the interest of any country that an administration should remain in power by buying up support, even if the object they have in view is a good one. But in the case to which I have adverted no such excuse can be urged. Here, with a large majority at their back, the Government seem powerless to carry through their policy except by bribes held out to various sections of the country. In confirmation of what I have said, I have only to take up the last report of the Department of Railways and Canals which has been distributed. I turn there to the railways and canals that we have authorized to be constructed consequent upon obtaining the support and assistance of members from different localities. Many of them are works of a purely local character, works that ought to be aided and subsidized by the municipalities, and if not by the municipalities then by the Provincial Governments. They are not works of that character that ought to be chargeable against the Federal power. I find that we commenced in 1882, when we decided that Quebec had to be recouped because she had built the North Shore Railway and extended it to the City or Ottawa. We felt that we had to recoup Quebec, under the Act of last Session to the extent of $2,394,000 for those two roads, and I notice by the papers to-day that we propose doing still more—we propose buying it (for it is announced that Sir Henry Tyler has decided to give up the struggle for the North Shore and decided to sell it) again from the Grand Trunk Railway Company. After having paid Quebec $2,394,000 towards the construction of those two roads, we are now to buy it from the present holders, the Grand Trunk Railway Company being the principal parties interested, in order that it may be made part of the through line. Having done that, what are we obliged to do? We are told that we must extend the northern system of railways from Gravenhurst to somewhere up near Lake Nipissing. For that we first voted $6,000 per mile, but that was not considered enough, and we made it $12,000 per mile. The gross amount in the first place was $660,000, and now it is considerably over $1,000,000. We were led from that into subsidizing a number of railways. Hon. gentleman here will say that many of the lines to which I advert are most important and useful. I am not questioning the assertion; on the contrary, I recognize that they are important, but are they such roads that we, in our position at the present moment, struggling to build this all-rail route from ocean to ocean, should further tax ourselves in order to construct? Many of them are, in my judgment, bogus affairs, simply got up to assist the promoters, to enable them, under the Government assist-

ance, to float bonds and make a good sum of money out of them, and allow the mortgagees or bondholders to take the road, they having made a considerable amount by the speculation. There are, no doubt, a good many roads that I could class as coming within that category. I find there was the railway from St. Raymond to Lake St. John, to which a subsidy of $384,000 was granted. Then the railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway at Riviere du Loup or Riviere Ouelle to Edmonston, $340,000. Then the following year we have the following grants made

To the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company for 100 miles of their railway, from Matapediac, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Paspebiac, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.. $320,000

To the Caraquet Railway Company, for 36 miles of their railway, from a point near Bathurst to Caraquet, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole 115,200

To the Gatineau Valley Railway Company for the first 50-mile section of their railway, from Hull station, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 160.000

That is a little railway running out by the house where I live in summer, a purely local work which ought to be built by the county in which it is situated. Then we come to

The Great American and European Short Line Railway Company, for 80 miles of their railway from Canso to Louisburg or Sydney, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole (that has been considerably augumented since)..... 256,000

To the International Railway Company, for 49 miles of their railway from Sherbrooke, in the Province of Quebec, to the International boundary line, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 156,800

In connection with the extension of this road through Maine to connect with New Brunswick, at or near Vanceborough or south of that point.

To the Northern and Western Railway Company, for 32 miles of their railway, from the Intercolonial Railway, near the Miramichi, to Moran's, near Demphy Village, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 102,400

To the Montreal and Western Railway Company, for the first 50-mile section of their railway, out of St. Jerome, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.. 160,000

The next is a little railway running through the county which my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice formerly represented :

To the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, for 28 miles of their railway, from Napanee to Tamworth, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.. 89,600

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for 25 miles of their railway, from St. Raymond to Lake St. John, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole 80,000
In addition to the subsidy granted by the Act forty-fifth Victoria, chapter fourteen.

For a railway from the Intercolonial Railway at Peticodiac to Havelock Corner, in the Province of New Brunswick, 12 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile. nor exceeding in the whole..... 38,400

For the construction of a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax by the shortest and best practicable route, after the report of competent engineers, a subsidy not exceeding $170,000 per annum for fifteen years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on bonds of the company undertaking the work. That, if rumor says true, is a railway that is going to run across the State of Maine, and justifies the remark of a gentleman who was a member of the first Government after Confederation, Hon. Wm. Macdougall, that the building of the Intercolonial Railway by the route selected was simply throwing $7,000,000 into the sea. Probably after constructing that short line we may find that a very considerable portion of the Intercolonial Railway will be useful only for purely local purposes.

For the construction of a line of railway from Oxford Station, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Sydney or Louisburg, a subsidy not exceeding $30,000 per annum for fifteen years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds of the company undertaking the work, in addition to the subsidies previously granted, and also a lease or transfer to such company of the Eastern Extension Railway, from New Glasgow to Canso, with its presente quipment.

To the Quebec Central Railway Company, for a line of railway from Beauce Junction to the International boundary line, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 211,200

For the extension for the Canadian Pacific Railway, from its terminus at St. Martin's Junction, near Montreal, or some other point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the harbor of Quebec, in such manner as may be approved by the Governor in-Council, a subsidy not exceeding $6,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole 960,000

To the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company—wherever that is; I suppose it is somewhere in this locality—for a line of railway from the Victoria branch of the Midland Railway, to the village of Bancroft, in the township of Dungannon, county of Hastings, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 160,000

To the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway, for a line of railway from Hull or Aylmer to Pembroke, provided the Ottawa river is crossed at some point not east of Lapasse, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.. 272,000

To the Gatineau Railway Company, for a line of railway from Kazuabazua to Le Desert—that is about 100 miles up the Gatineau—a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 160,000

To the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, for a line of railway from Tamworth to Bogart and Bridgewater, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 70,400

The Montreal and Western Railway Company, for a line of railway from the end of the line subsidized in the now last Session of Parliament, towards Le Desert, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 160,000

The County of Ottawa was particularly favored, I think. No less than four lines of railway in the County of Ottawa have got large subsidies. No doubt they are excellent lines for the people living in the locality, but certainly they are not works of a national character that ought to be paid for out of the general revenues of this country.

To the Northern and Western Railway Company, for a line of railway from Fredericton to the Miramichi River, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the (whole instead of the subsidy proposed in 1883)..... 128,000

To the Erie and Huron Railway Company, for a line of railway from Wallaceburg to Sarnia, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole 96,000

This Erie and Huron line runs through a rich section of the Province of Ontario. I have no doubt it is a very useful line, but it is a comparatively local one.

To the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company, for a line of railway from Cornwall to Perth, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 262,400

I understand that on the faith of that the bonds of this road have been issued, and $50,000 have been subscribed, and that up to the present time there has not been a shovel of earth spread, and yet capitalists have been induced to pay that amount of money towards this railway, which is to cross the country from the town of Cornwall to Perth.

To the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, for a line of railway from Mississippi to Renfrew, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole 48,000

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for that portion of their railway between St. Jerome and New Glasgow, in the county of Terrebonne, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 32,000

For a line of railway and bridge between the Jacques Cartier Union Railway Junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway and St. Martin's Junction, connecting the Jacques Cartier Union Railway with the North Shore Railway proper, a subsidy not exceeding in the whole..... 200,000

For a line of railway from Richibucto to St. Louis, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.. 22,400

For a line of railway from Hopewell to Alma, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.. 51,200

For a line of railway from St. Andrews to Lachute, in the county of Argenteuil, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.. 22,400

For a line of railway from the Grand Piles, on the River St. Maurice, to Lake Edward, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 217,600

For a line of railway from Annapolis to Digby, in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole..... 64,000

For a line of the Central Railway from the head of Grand Lake to the Intercolonial Railway, between Sussex and St. John, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole 128,000

To the Caraquet Railway Company, for the extension of their line of railway from Caraquet to Shippigan Harbour, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor eqceeding in the whole 76,800

For a branch of the Intercolonial Railway, from Metapediac eastward, towards Paspebiac, twenty miles, in the Province of Quebec, a sum not exceeding in the whole..... 300,000

For a branch of the Intercolonial Railway, from Derby Station to Indian-Town, fourteen miles, a sum not exceeding in the whole..... 140,000

Now, that is an evidence of the way in which the moneys of this country are being spent, and although it is exceedingly proper to stimulate local enterprises if we have an overflowing treasury by which we can do it, I think it is rather a grave and serious question when our national debt has sprung up so rapidly, and must for a time continue to grow, that we should be subsidizing local works of this kind that ought to be supported and sustained by local enterprise, and the cor-

porations of the municipalities through which the lines run, or by the provincial authorities. I say it might be all very well when we had this inflated revenue under the prosperous times that have favored the regime of this Government; but is that always going to last? Are we always going to be able to buy as largely abroad, and pay the high duties that we have been paying the last two or three years? I find that the general trade of the country has not shown that extraordinary expansion that I think should be seen in a young country like Canada, possessed of the grand resources we have, owning such vast and valuable timber forests, the products of which are in demand on the other side of the water. We possess, beyond doubt, a most fertile soil, yet with all those advantages, it is rather unfortunate that our trade is not a growing trade. I was quite surprised on turning to statistics of an old country like England to find that, even in years of depression, their trade has been steadily growing from one year to another, and that their trade with the rest of the world has been increasing. Our experience in this country has been to the contrary. I find that in 1874, just 10 years ago, our exports were $89,000,000, and that last year, when one would suppose that an extraordinary development must have taken place, for we had an increase in our population, and certainly we have had an increase in territory, yet our exports have risen in those 10 years only from $89,000,000 to $91,000,000, an increase of just $2,000,000 in 10 years. No doubt there have been ups and downs in that interval, but I happened to take those ten years to point to the lesson that one cannot ignore—that the growth of trade in this country has not been as continuous or steadily increasing as one would naturally expect to find it. Our imports have been at times very large. In 1874 they had risen to as high as $127,000,000; in 1884 we find that they were only $108,000,000, and that in the last three years our imports have fallen, under the influence, no doubt, of our high tariff. Some hon. gentleman may say that that was the fulfilment of the prophecy of those who supported the National Policy; that we are not going to buy abroad; that we are to manufacture everything for ourselves, and that we are no longer to send our money out of the country for what we could procure ourselves. The farmer was to have his market in the towns, and the manufacturers were to depend on the farmers to consume their manufactures; but under the high tariff and increased imports during the good times, the revenue of this country shot up at least one-third. We collected some six or seven millions of dollars more during the year after the high tariff came into operation than we had been in the habit of collecting in former years under similar circumstances. That is, there was one-third additional duty added, and we got the benefit of it in our revenue In 1883 our imports were $123,000,000; in 1884 it had dropped down to $108,000,000—a falling off of $15,000,000 in one year. That must necessarily have affected our revenue very considerably. Our tariff now is supposed to be at its highest, and it is not proposed to add anything to it, yet if the imports are to go down perceptibly in the future where are we to get our revenue for ordinary expenditure? That brings me to another subject which may not be germane to this Bill, but is an opportune subject to discuss on this question of expenditure of money. We find that what is called our ordinary expenditure, that is, the carrying on of the government of this country and its management, not only through the various departments but through the outside service, has grown from 1867-68, when it was $6,700,000, to $11,250,000 last year. That was the ordinary expenditure of the country. It developed, no doubt, under the stimulus of surpluses which permit governments, as they permit individuals, to be more profuse in their expenditures, and not quite so careful of the moneys of the people. But the particular item to which I would draw attention at this moment is that relating to civil government, which appertains to the departments exclusively—the salaries of the Ministers, and the salaries of their clerks in the departments. In 1867-68 that cost us $591,000; in 1878 it had grown to nearly $823,000. Last year it was over a million dollars, and I find by the estimates this year that it is proposed to ask Parliament to authorize them to spend on the departments of this country $1,200,506. Now that might be, I will not say very proper, but it might be justifiable

if the revenues of the country were keeping up a healthy surplus, and it was in the interests of the country to keep up a high duty; but clearly in the condition of things to which I have drawn attention—that is, the ever-increasing expenditures in all branches of the public service; it does not seem to me to be the duty of a prudent government to continue to spend so large a sum on the mere management of the service of the country—not on the service but the management of the service. I recollect not many years ago when hon. gentlemen in this House were in the habit of representing the gross extravagance and recklessness of the Ministry of which I was a member, and pointing to the number of extra clerks then on the list, and suggesting how much better and cheaper the administration of affairs could be carried on if a change of government took place; yet we find that with all the forethought claimed by the gentlemen who expressed those views at that time, and their anxiety for economy, when they came to possess the reins of government and had the opportunity to make the changes which they had previously discussed and so warmly advocated, the change has been altogether in a different direction, and the increase is making rapid progress. In 1878 the expenditure for civil government amounted to $823,000, and this year it has risen to $1,200,000. It seems to me that for carrying on our federal system this is rather an extreme figure. It leaves on the head of each family of five persons a burden of $1 a year to pay the salaries of the Federal Ministers and their clerks, and this does not include the superannuation account, which, I am sorry to say, is steadily on the increase. I have often found it my duty to call attention to what I consider a great abuse, that of superannuating members of the civil service who are in comparative youth, who at all events have not reached that time of life when they are not capable of serving their country in the position of clerks. I have often called attention to this matter, and have pointed out that many excellent and useful public officers have been removed simply for the purpose of finding places for hangers-on who wanted favor and promotion. I say that this sum does not include the superannuations which now represent an amount of over $200,000 a year, or 25 cents per family, and when it is recollected that this $1.25 per family only represents our government through the federal system, and when we come to consider that the country has to pay a very considerable additional sum for its government through the provincial system, one cannot but come to the conclusion that Canada is a very much over-governed country. Between the federal and provincial governments, and with a population of a little under 5,000,000 of people, I think we are paying unduly for even a very good government—for the best government that Canada might obtain. I have avoided details, and I do not propose to go into details, because it is not perhaps proper to do so on the present occasion. I desired simply, as this Bill is passing through, to call attention to the prominent points, and to the great development of our public debt, and to show to the House one, at all events, of the causes that have led to this enormous accumulation of debt. It is, as I said a while ago, owing to our not being sufficiently uncompromising. We are supposed to follow the system that prevails in England, and who ever heard of a British Minister consenting to have his general policy carried by giving way to sections of the House, and to squads of half a dozen members here and there, in order that he might carry some great measure that he could not otherwise recommend to Parliament with any chance of its being adopted. No one for a moment imagines that three-fourths of the projects to which I have drawn attention would independently have received the support of Parliament. Parliament would never have thought of giving aid to many of the railways to which I have adverted if they were not connected with a grand project, which grand project required a large vote, and to get the vote of the majority of the House various sections of the country had to receive each its *quid pro quo*. I remember in the early history of this country something of the same kind was done, but on a much smaller scale. My hon. friend will recollect that in giving the Grand Trunk Railway subsidies it frequently became necessary, in order to obtain the sanction of Parliament to those subsidies, to make grants to other lines. It was in that way that the St. Lawrence & Ottawa, the

Brockville & Ottawa, the Port Hope & Lindsay, and several other branch lines obtained subsidies—because it became necessary in order to get the votes of the members who represented those districts for the subsidy to the Grand Trunk Railway to subsidize those lines. It was on a very small scale then, and the amounts were very much less considering the relative strength of the country then and its strength to-day. I say that the bills of those days were very much smaller than those to which I have drawn attention, and which have marked the legislation of the last two years. We cannot go on very much further unless, indeed, the good fortune that has attended this country and other countries that have been in debt for the last ten years should continue to favor them, and that is the fall in the value of money. That has been a great assistance to us. The fall in the value of money has been equivalent to a saving of $2,000,000 a year to this country. If this depreciation in the value of money goes on, of course Canada will largely benefit by it in making exchanges of our bonds in future years: but even at this time, with the growth of the country, with its vast advantages, our money ought to become even cheaper than it is. The present loan that is being negotiated is at 4 per cent. Why is it the people of the United States should be able to borrow money at three per cent? Why is it that their fours are quoted to-day at about eighteen per cent. per annum? Surely this country ought to be as good a paymaster. We do not, no matter what happens in this country, propose to repudiate. We will be able always to pay our debts, and the sentiment of this country is not in any sense in favor of repudiation, even to the extent to which it has been agitated in the United States, and therefore capitalists should have no fear in investing in Canadian bonds. There will be no fear that our bonds, whatever they amount to, will be paid off at less than 100 cents to the dollar, and therefore I say our credit ought to be higher to-day than it is. Although we have, to a great extent, got the advantage of this fall in the value of money, we have not reaped to the full extent the advantage of it—not to the extent that some other colonies have done. We know that some of the Australian colonies are borrowing on better terms than we are.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No.

HON. MR. PLUMB—New Zealand is paying more.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I am referring to New South Wales. I do not know any other country in the world as heavily burdened as New Zealand is. I remember recently examining the figures of some of the Australian colonies, and I know that they were getting money somewhat cheaper than we were. There is that in the future that will come to our aid and assistance. The tendency of the times is to cheapen money. There seems to be a greater accumulation of money in the world than can be wisely used, and the reversals that capitalists meet with now and then are making them more cautious and careful as to their investments, and therefore it does seem extraordinary, that while investors are in many ways only getting two per cent., we in Canada should be paying four. Of course it has a great advantage as compared with the position we held years before, but it ought to be greater than it is, and I hope the day is not far distant when we will be able to borrow even cheaper. I think the time has come to consider whether we are not rushing on too rapidly, and whether we ought not to hesitate before we assume further responsibilities considering the heavy amount that our public debt has already reached.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend has found a great deal of fault with the administration of the Government, but it seems to me that he is doing it at rather the wrong moment. He lays great stress upon the powers which have been given to the Government from time to time during the past years to aid various railway companies. Now it seems to me that the time to have raised objections to that policy was when these bills were before the House. The House of Commons saw fit to adopt that plan to grant subsidies to the various railways which my hon. friend has mentioned. I do not remember that when the Bill came before this House my hon. friend raised that warning voice which

he has raised now, for the time being at all events, in such melancholy tones. I do not believe that the country is going so rapidly to the bad as my hon. friend suggested, and I think that when we consider the circumstances under which these various railway subsidies were granted, the House will feel that my hon. friend has drawn altogether too sad a picture of the present position of the country. In the first place the hon. gentleman must bear in mind that at the time that policy was adopted—proposed by the Government no doubt, and the Government responsible for it, no doubt, but adopted very generally by a large vote of the House at that time—there was a large surplus revenue in the treasury which consisted of several millions each year, and it was the complaint raised against the Government that we were heaping up money for no purpose, and we were challenged by the Opposition then for so doing. It was under those circumstances, and the revenue being in that prosperous condition that this mode of restoring part of it to the people was proposed. This money is not thrown into the river, though the advantage to the country of the railways is more or less doubted by the hon. gentleman; but it is beyond all doubt, although that policy may have gone too far, and that many of those railways will not answer the purposes which their projectors contemplated, and in many respects some of those subsidies would have been better withheld, that in others the policy was sound and wise, and it was desirable to expend part of the surplus revenues of the country to encourage railway enterprises throughout the various provinces. For the hon. gentleman to say that was done by way of a bribe to members of Parliament is wholly unjustifiable. The proposition was in the general interests of the country, and for the purpose of aiding railway enterprises in various parts of it. Then the hon. gentleman would have the House suppose that that money is all expended, whereas on the contrary nine railways out of ten in the districts mentioned have not earned or obtained any portion of it.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Part of this loan is for that purpose.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, in nine cases out of ten the companies have not earned any right to the money.

Hon. Mr. POWER—It shows what they were—election kites.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, it does not; it shows that the hopes and expectations of those who projected those railways were not realized, and that even with the assistance of the legislature they were not able to carry out their enterprises. The hon. gentleman read two or three pages from the Railway Subsidies Bill in sad tones, and foreshadowed all sorts of evil things, but took no thought to ascertain what has been done, and what amount of money has been spent upon those railways. Take first the subsidy to the Province of Quebec in consideration of their having constructed the railway from Quebec to Montreal, $954,000.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—That has been paid.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—Not a dollar of it; it has still to be paid. Then take the next portion between Montreal and Ottawa, $1,440,000; that has been paid. Then take the line connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax; that subsidy has not been paid. Then take the Irondale and Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company line from the Victoria branch of the Midland railway to the village of Bancroft, in the county of Hastings; that has not been paid. Then take the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway; that has not been paid.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I think my hon. friend is wrong in saying that the first line mentioned is not paid. Last year $2,400,000 was paid to the Province of Quebec.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, my hon. friend is mistaken; it has not been paid, and it has not been earned. The $954,000 is still in dispute.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—That is another item.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, that is the first item, the item the hon.

gentleman referred to. The portion between Montreal and Ottawa, 120 miles, $12,000 per mile, that has been paid over, but the first item the hon. gentleman laid stress upon, is not paid, nor any other of the items which I have mentioned. Then take the Gatineau Valley Railway Company, line from Kazabazua to the Desert, $160,000, not a dollar of it has been paid. The Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company has been paid. The Montreal and Western Railway Company, for a line of railway from the end of the line subsidized towards the Desert, has not been paid. The Northern and Western Railway Company, for a line of railway from Fredericton to the Miramichi River, has not been paid; and I venture to say, without having any information, and without being certain, that out of the whole list there are not half a dozen where the money has been paid, so that the thing is not so dark in that respect as my hon. friend has made it appear. With all respect to the opinions of the hon. gentleman, it was the opinion of Parliament that these subsidies should be voted, and the decision of the majority of Parliament ought to govern, and not the views of my hon. friend. Some members of the Opposition exerted themselves to get these subsidies, and no doubt it is fair to add that when the Government of Ontario granted money here and there and everywhere through the province to assist railway enterprises, nobody said it was done with a view to bribing members of the legislature in this part or any other part of the Province of Ontario, and nothing but praises were lavished on the Government for so doing. My hon. friend was a member of that Government, and advocated and carried into effect the very policy which he is now condemning on the part of this Government.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—We had the money.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—And we had the money. It is the same policy precisely as was adopted by the Government of Ontario. They assisted in various parts of the country the railway enterprises of the province, and they did so out of the surplus gathered together by their predecessors under the late Sanfield Macdonald. It is that very principle carried out upon a larger scale, not limited to the Province of Ontario, which the hon. gentleman now condemns.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The Ontario Government had a surplus.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—They had a surplus, so had we. We had a much larger surplus. The Government of the Dominion were in receipt of a large surplus revenue yearly; and it was because they were in receipt of a large surplus that they felt at liberty to assist railway enterprises in the interests of all parts of the country. I admit that this policy might be carried to excess; but I say that if the policy is administered fairly, and with reference to enterprises that are general in their nature, and general in their advantages to the country, it is not a bad policy, without carrying it too far, to justify the vote given in each particular case to each particular railway, which is a point on which one cannot speak in general terms. The particular circumstances in each case were discussed in the other branch of the legislature when this Act was passed, and the general result was adopted by the House of Commons, and confirmed in this Chamber. Then the hon. gentleman says that we were very wrong not only in that, but the augmentation of the public debt even during the last two years, has been something awful, and it is impossible to contemplate it without fear for the future, and without condemning the extravagance of the Government. The hon. gentleman does not do the Government justice in that respect He does not do the Government justice, because he did not point out the various expenditures which they were necessarily compelled to make in pursuing the policy laid down by Parliament. In the $7,000,000 item of increase, he overlooked the fact of the assumption by the Dominion of the amount by which the provinces were allowed to increase their indebtedness. The various provinces of the Dominion, from time to time as they came in, were allowed a certain amount of debt. Those debts were increased by a very considerable amount prior to 1882 or 1883. In 1882-83 the amounts by which they were allowed to increase

their debts were capitalized, and the sum was added to our debt and that sum amounted to $7,722,000. There, at one stroke, we increased the capital debt of the country by $7,000,000, and if the hon. gentleman was desirous of doing the Government justice, he should have given us credit on that score. Then again we have spent a great deal of money on the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman himself was in favor of the Pacific Railway, and the expenditure was sanctioned by a large majority of Parliament. We gave the Pacific Railway $25,000,000; out of that they have received some 17 or 18 millions, which would increase the public debt by that amount. Then we lent them $30,000,000. There is an increase of nearly $50,000,000 in these two items. Add to this the $7,000,000 which we increased the public debt by in order to capitalize the debts of the various provinces; add $750,000 for the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, and $250,000 for the dry dock, and there are the items to which the increase of the obligations of this country during the last two or three years, to which the hon. gentleman has made reference, are attributable. Now, these increases were sanctioned by the whole Parliament. The railway to British Columbia was one of the results of the entering of that province into the Union. We were all obliged to do it; we did it upon the best terms that could be obtained at the time, and upon far better terms than the hon. gentleman's Government was willing to adopt. That is quite clear, so that there at once is accounted for the whole debt, which the hon. gentleman mentions as one of the great sins of the present Government, that in the course of two or three years we have added $54,000,000 to the debt of the country. We have added it for the purposes I have mentioned. They were justifiable purposes, in the interest of the country, and we are reaping the advantages to a great extent of the expenditure. Did we not reap an advantage, when the country was in great trouble and anxiety with reference to disturbances in the North-West, from the Pacific Railway? Would peace have been restored as soon as it has been—would we now be happily contemplating the return of the troops, as I mentioned during the afternoon to my hon. friend from Halifax—would the anxieties of the fathers and mothers of the soldiers who are fighting in the North-West have terminated at this time if we had not the Canadian Pacific Railway? They would not; we should most likely have been refused permission to send our troops through the United States. The rebellion broke out when there was no possibility of sending troops up by water, and you would have had rebellion raging over fifty times the space, and requiring fifty times the expenditure, if it could be subdued this summer at all, if we had not possessed the Canadian Pacific Railway. I can say that this railway has already saved the country an enormous sum of money by the facilities it has given us for suppressing that disturbance. These are some of the advantages the country has derived from that expenditure, and I do not think it is fair to accuse the Government in that general, and if I may say it without offence, in that loose way of increasing the debt of the country in those large figures without stating at the same time why that debt has been increased and to what purpose the money has gone. Then the hon. gentleman complains, and groans, so to speak, over the fact that we are not effecting loans in England on the same terms as the United States; and he asked why should we not? Was it ever known that a small community could raise money at such a low rate of interest as a large community like the United States? It has never been known. When the hon. gentleman says that we are paying more than our fellow colonists he is mistaken. The four per cents. of Canada command as good a price as those of any of the colonies—in fact a better price. I think I saw that not long ago in a statement in the hand of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, showing what the colony (I have forgotten the name of it, but one of the Ausralian colonies which for a long time had taken the lead of Canada) was getting for its four per cents. Comparing that with the rate we are getting for our four per cents., it showed we had the advantage over that colony which up to that time had been foremost in the advantageous terms on which it had been able to borrow money. I am very confident that that is the fact and that we have been borrowing

money latterly at better rates than any of our sister colonies. To compare us with the United States seems to me to be only an effort of the hon. gentleman to throw additional dark colouring into the picture which he was drawing of disaster arising over the country. No country situated as ours is can expect to borrow on the same favourable terms as the United States, and I think no reasonable man would expect it.

I do not intend to pursue the argument further. I was only desirous of answering the hon. gentleman as far as I could at present on the various points he mentioned with reference to the credit of the country and the application of these sums of money. But the House will remember that this Bill does not directly bear on any of those questions ; that it is to enable us to borrow money, and the proper time to find fault with the Government is when the Bills for the expenditure of the money are before the House. If the hon. gentleman, when the "Omnibus Railway Bill" was before the House, had spoken, he would have impressed us with the idea that the purpose he had in view was to convince the House that the expenditure should not take place and—was not merely to throw discredit on the Government—that this object was really to check enormous expenditure.

HON. MR. SCOTT—This loan is to cover many of the railways to which I have referred.

HON. MR. READ—New Zealand borrowed at 4½ per cent. and issued at 84.

HON. MR. POWER—The only thing the hon. gentleman from Ottawa said about New Zealand was, that it was probably the most deeply involved of all the colonies. I think I am entitled to the gratitude of the House for having caused the third reading of this Bill to be deferred until to-day, because the result of that postponement has been that the Bill which would have passed *sub silentio* has given rise to, I think, almost the most interesting debate we have had this session. It has brought out the leaders of both sides of the House in full force. As the House has listened to those gentleman with pleasure, I do not propose inflict myself on it for any length of time. I think that the Minister was hardly fair to the hon. gentleman from Ottawa in finding fault with him for speaking of these railway grants in discussing this Bill. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa, naturally and properly, when this Bill came up to borrow a very large sum of money, reviewing the causes which had led to the necessity for the borrowing, and one of the causes—as the hon. gentleman from Ottawa thought a very potent cause—of the necessity for this large loan was the Omnibus Railway Act from which he read. I do not think that it lay altogether with the Minister of Justice to tell the hon. gentleman that this Act had been ineffectual or to find fault with the hon. gentleman from Ottawa because as it has happened, these sums have not been called for. I sometimes think that there is too much of the Nathaniel about my hon. friend from Ottawa for the circumstances in which he is placed. He does not give his opponents credit for the guile which they possess at least in a considerable degree. If the hon. member from Ottawa had had a little less of the simplicity of the dove, he would have known very well in 1882, when the hon. gentlemen opposite were going to the country and the Omnibus Bill was passed, that the object of the Bill was as clear as possible to any one who understand the methods of hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends. Any one who knew much about the circumstances of these railways knew, in 1882, as well as we know to-day, that those railway grants provided for at that time, would not secure the construction of the roads ; but what they did do, and what it was intended they should do, was to secure the support of the people of the different districts through which these roads, if built, would run, at the ensuing election ; and the Act I think was fairly successful in that way, or we would not have the hon. gentleman where he is at present perhaps.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is your evil thought.

HON. MR. POWER—It does not do to be too simple. The hon. Minister, while he took hold of the two or three oversights in the speech of the hon. gentleman from Ottawa did not grapple with

the strong points of the hon. gentleman's argument, and there, I think, again he shows that—what shall I call it?—tact, I shall not say guile—

HON. MR. PLUMB—Call it anything you like.

HON. MR. POWER—I call it tact—in dealing with the argument of his opponent. It is a very good plan to leave out of sight the strong points of your opponent's argument, take the weak ones and beat him on those, and leave him in triumph. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa called attention—he did not deal simply with the increase of the debt in two years—to the increase since Confederation—to the increase since the hon. gentleman took power in 1878; and I think anyone, who studies fairly that sheet in the Public Accounts which shows the gradual increase of our debt, and the other sheet which shows the gradual increase of the annual expenditure, will find there occasion for very serious thought. The Minister was very facetious over the melancholy tone with which the hon. gentleman from Ottawa dealt with the matter; but to anyone who is interested in the welfare of the country, the contemplation of those sheets in the Public Accounts is calculated to cause very serious thoughts indeed. I cannot help being a little surprised when I think of the tone in which hon. gentlemen spoke opposite a few years ago in 1877 and 1878 when our debt was not more than half of what it is to-day—when I remember the tone of almost despair in which they talked of the future of the country—I am rather surprised to find them as cheerful as they are now. I remember when the $5,000 spent on the Neebing Hotel, caused hon. gentlemen in this Chamber the most fearful anxiety, worry and dismay.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, it was amusement.

HON. MR. POWER—That was not the way in which hon. gentlemen talked then; it was not a facetious thing at all. The Minister has given certain items which he says account for the increase in the public debt, but those are items which only account for an increase during the past two years. As the hon. gentleman from Ottawa showed, the debt of this country has increased steadily since 1867. The net debt then was, I think, about $66,000,000. Hon. gentlemen must remember that these provinces had been administering their governments for a great many years before 1867, and during all that time all the Provinces together had accumulated a debt amounting altogether to about $70,000,000. In 1878 the net debt of the Dominion amounted to about $140,000,000; on the first of July of last year the net debt amounted to about $190,000,000; and at the present time, as the hon. gentleman from Ottawa said, the net debt amounts to over $200,000,000, and this increase has gone on. Until the other day we had no war to account for this enormous increase. Our neighbors across the border have been reducing their debt very rapidly during all this time. There are some expenditures to which the Minister did not refer. In the first place this process has been going on. Almost every year since the present administration has come in there has been a sum of half a million of dollars or more charged to capital account for the Intercolonial Railway. That sum has been, as we have all along contended, improperly charged. It has been charged, for instance, for new rolling stock made necessary by the wearing out of the old rolling stock. That is clearly a thing not chargeable to capital. A very large amount has accrued in that way. Some of the debt has accrued from charging to capital repairs on the Intercolonial Railway. Unless I am mistaken, since the change of Government the amount charged to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway has been increased by some twenty millions of dollars. A great portion of that has been altogether indefensible expenditure. It certainly ought not to have been charged to capital account. Then large sums have been expended in the erection of public buildings, some of them necessary, some unnecessary. Expensive public buildings have been put up in places where cheap ones would have suited. For instance, one has only to go across the river to the adjoining county to find a post-office in the city of Hull which cost enough money and is large enough for a city of ten times

the population. All over the country these buildings have been erected, and they have served to a certain extent the same purpose that the Omnibus Railway Bill did. Everyone knows that if an election is coming off, the letting of a contract for a large public building in the centre of a county has a very considerable effect on the ensuing election. I have mentioned the Intercolonial Railway and the public buildings. Talking of public buildings, here is an expenditure taking place within a stone's throw of the building we are in now, which is altogether indefensible. The Government thought it necessary to secure additional accommodation for certain officers. The Government own here ground affording unrivalled sites for public buildings. There is ample room, close to the eastern block, and to the western block also, to have put up public buildings, but instead of using the ground which they possess they chose to go outside and pay $60,000 or $70,000 for land across the street. The moneys that the Government have spent in connection with the North-West have been very much larger than they ought to be, and have largely increased the public debt. Speaking of railways I was reminded that there is a proposition now before Parliament to spend a sum equivalent to $5,000,000 in subsidizing a railway which is currently supposed to be owned by a minister—at least a company who are likely to secure this sum of money are supposed to be presided over by a minister of the Crown —and the real object of the railway, and the effect that it will have if built, as proposed in the resolutions introduced in the other House, will be to bring Canadian business to ports in the United States. The minister said we had great cause for congratulation in the fact that the large expenditure we had made on the Canadian Pacific Railway had given us an opportunity of getting our troops into the North-West and quelling the rebellion speedily. It is perfectly true that if there had been no Pacific Railway we might have had difficulty in getting our troops into the North-West. I am disposed to think myself that the United States Government would not have seriously objected to allow our troops to pass through their territory; but supposing it had been as the Minister says, there is another point to be considered which the Minister conveniently left out of sight, and that is that we should not have had any rebellion at all, if it had not been for the blundering of the Government. If they had governed that North-West country properly, there would have been no rebellion and no necessity for spending money there at all.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is very easily disposed of.

HON. MR. POWER—Yes.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—It is a Grit view

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman to the left of the Minister says that that is a Grit view. I do not think that it is an exclusively Grit view. I think if the hon. gentleman would travel through the North-West—I do not mean in the palace car of the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but if he went around amongst the people of the North-West to ascertain what they really feel, he would find that that Grit view was the prevalent view in the North-West. I think if the hon. gentleman travels in the province of Quebec he will find that that Grit view pervades Conservative circles there.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Has my hon. friend himself travelled in the North-West?

HON. MR. POWER—No.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—How do you know then?

HON. MR. POWER—I know people who did, and the informants from whom I got the most definite information were not Liberals but Conservatives—men who are still Conservatives, although they are very much disgusted with the Minister of the Interior and with Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney. They felt that their loyalty to their party was very considerably strained by the acts of those gentlemen.

HON. MR. PLUMB—What are those acts?

HON. MR. POWER—To tell all those things would be undertaking too serious a

contract. It would require one of the speeches of the hon. gentleman from Niagara to deal with a subject like that.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Yes, to deal with it fairly.

HON. MR. POWER—There is only one other point that I wish to say something on. The Minister in defending that Omnibus Railway scheme said that the Government had been challenged for heaping up surpluses. It is true there was something said about the impropriety of a Government having surpluses. That was the view promulgated by the hon. gentleman who is now Canadian Commissioner in England. He said that when his opponents were in power. But the hon. Minister of Justice should have been as ingenuous, as he suggested the hon. member from Ottawa should have been, and should have gone on and said that the surplus should be diminished by decreasing taxation; and the reason given by the Reform party for that was that when the Government had the money in their hands they would be tempted to spend it foolishly as they have been spending it. Here we are, after all these years of surpluses that we have heard so much about, proposing to borrow $30,000,000 to pay off floating debts incurred by the Government who have had so many surpluses.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I rise with some reluctance to claim the attention of the House on this subject again for a very few moments. I desire to say with regard to the statement made by the hon. member from Ottawa that I know the views which he has expressed are very much the views of the people from end to end of this Dominion in regard to the public expenditures, firstly, that the Government are altogether too sanguine as to the future increase of the population of the Dominion; and secondly, that party conflict has now assumed that phase that it is simply the question of the party now in power, by any and every means, endeavoring to keep the other party out, by compromises, by bribing individuals and the provinces. This is the general feeling of the country—the feeling of men of all parties. There is assuredly, irregularity and impropriety in our being now asked to give such large borrowing powers without knowing the purposes to which the moneys are to be applied. I am sure the House will agree with me that it is never safe to give any Government possession of more money than they actually require. We know from the history of the past how governments, when they have had possession of public money, have used it most improperly, and not in the interests of the country. For instance, when the Government advances money to a bank in temporary trouble, are we to take the simple statement of the Government that they advance that money on patriotic grounds? They seldom give money to a bank without making it in some way contribute to the support of their party. I have known, of my own knowledge, where they have assisted banks, that they have drawn indirectly large amounts from that bank for party purposes, and that on certain occasions, when the cashier has refused to cash the notes of party political supporters who were not very solvent, they have threatened the cashier with removal. I am prepared to prove this before a committee if the House will give me one. It is never safe to give any government the possession of more money than they require for the purposes sanctioned by Parliament. If we do not know it, experience will soon teach us that a young country like this requires to be governed with prudence and care. It is all very well for the Government to be adding, during two years, as the hon. member from Ottawa says, $54,000,000 to the debt of the country, and every succeeding year five or ten millions more, instead of raising all ordinary deficits from the revenue of the country; we can go on in that course only to a certain extent, but no people will long acquiesce in such a practice. If we only consider the circumtances of the Province of Quebec, the Maritime Provinces and British Columbia. I do not speak of Ontario because it is so fertile and rich a province that it will bear larger burdens, but the other provinces are not prepared and will not agree to-day to have more burdens placed upon them. The placing a tariff of 35 per cent. on mowers and reapers entering Manitoba has caused great discontent. Those who settle in such a country are not of the

class to pay such import duties. As regards political leaders, we may find one man possessing great genius and talent; he may be an astute barrister and parliamentary debater, and he may further exercise extraordinary influence over his fellowmen, and still such a man may be, in regard to matters of finance, most unsafe to guide this country. I have again and again referred to this, because I feel that the Parliament of the country, members of both branches, do not exercise that control which they should exercise, for the safety of the country, over the present First Minister. It is one man that controls, at this moment, the whole Government. His voice is paramount, and all others blindly acquiesce; whatever he determines, the present Parliament seems ready to endorse, right or wrong. It is this that is leading to the misrule which has been correctly described by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa. He is simply dreaming in his anticipations of the near future of British Columbia and our North-West.

We all know that the North-West contains fertile land; we all know that British Columbia has an agreeable climate, and it has its timber and its fish and certain other resources, but ask any commercial man whether he thinks that population will go into British Columbia to-day rapidly. It must be a question of time. As regards the North-West with all its fertile land, immigration will only flow in there slowly, and we are not justified in forecasting a different future, and swelling, as we are doing, the public debt, and the public burdens. The country desired to have our Pacific Railway built north of Lake Superior, and extended into the fertile belt; but what we say is, there was a want of prudence in carrying it forward, and rushing it headlong to the Pacific coast, six years before it was necessary. This shows how entirely Parliament has surrendered its judgment, and those members who are spared to return here for five years, will see the Pacific Railway Company coming to Parliament each year for a grant of from $5,000,000 to $8,000,000 each session, as necessary for the sustenance of the road. I take this opportunity of referring to my having been somewhat misrepresented in regard to my views respecting the Intercolonial Railway. I have simply to state that I never opposed the building of the Intercolonial Railway; I simply said, when we found annual deficits, "Let us make the road a gift to the Maritime Provinces, and let them run it." I am sure that the hon. gentleman near me did not desire to misrepresent me. I did not oppose the building of that road, but simply made the above suggestion.

HON. MR. DEVER—Why should we run it?

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—And the deficits still continue to this moment, and the capital expenditure for that road has been swollen, from $22,000,000 to some $38,000,000.

HON. MR. POWER—To over $40,000,000.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Ottawa, that the question of the Government of this country has now become a desperate conflict to keep the Opposition out of power, by fair means and by foul, at any sacrifice of principle or at any cost The people of the country now know it, and have become aroused to the embarrassments which are thus being brought upon us. The present Conservative Chieftain cares not, whether he increases the public debt $100,000,000 or to any extent. I have very little more to say to my colleagues of the Senate, for whom it is well known I entertain the highest respect, than that the First Minister will use this august body composed as it is of the leading men of the Dominion—that he will use them for his party purposes until the feeling of the country becomes agitated against a second Chamber; and should the people demand the abolition of this House, he will turn round against you and then say, that you were yourselves to blame for not acting according to your own convictions. We all know what a desperate politician is. He has no gratitude for any one—to any province or to the people; it is simply with him the passion for power, the most absorbing of all passions, and the man who has that passion, will sacrifice his friends and his foes, and will not hesitate to sacrifice his country.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I regret very much that the leader of the Opposition has sprung this debate upon us. Certainly the House has been taken by surprise upon the third reading of this Bill, when a small explanation was asked for, that we should have a debate sprung upon us on the financial affairs of the Dominion. I am not much surprised at the way in which the leader of the Opposition has treated this matter. He commenced by showing that there has been an increase of $54,000,000 in the public debt during the last two years. The leader of the Government has clearly explained how that increase has been brought about; that instead of it being a cause of complaint against the Government it was a debt properly incurred, as regards the $7,000,000 granted to the different provinces and the money granted to the Pacific Railway, which my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will not say was an improper grant. In fact, the hon. gentleman has justified it by his silence if not by his argument. Then there is also the money granted the Province of British Columbia for the Island Railway. With regard to that sum also the hon. gentleman must know that under the Carnarvon terms, the responsibility thrown on the people of this country was incurred by the previous Government. They, under the Carnarvon terms, agreed that certain works should be done in British Columbia, and the Government have ever since carried upon their shoulders the responsibility of seeing that the Pacific province was in some way remunerated in the direction in which the Reform Government had committed the country to. The hon. gentleman talks of bribes to the provinces. I am surprised that my hon. friend should use an argument like that. He has failed to show us that any subsidies voted to the railway enterprises are not in the interest of the country. He could not put his finger upon one and say that it was not in the general interest of the Dominion, except one road that passes near his country residence in the county of Ottawa. He did not, even when that was before the House, raise any objection to the subsidy, and he would not have dared, at the time that the project was proposed, to offer any opposition to it. To my mind it is conclusive proof that he could not venture to say that any other of these railway subsidies was not in the general interests of the country.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear! hear!

HON. MR. KAULBACH—My hon. friend from Halifax says "hear! hear!" but I will call his attention to some remarks of his on this subject in a few moments. Some time ago the leader of the Opposition considered that it was rather a lamentable fact that the imports of the country were falling off; but he must understand that under the National Policy it was expected that many of the articles we used to import would be manufactured in our own country from the raw material which we produce. The hon. gentleman spoke about the increase in the cost of civil government of the country. He must be aware, however, that there is also an increase in the public service of the country. Look at the condition of our postal service throughout the Dominion. Look at the thousands of miles covered by the postal service, and the enormous number of offices open all over the Dominion? Let him look at the lighthouse service all over the coasts of Nova Scotia and the Gulf of St. Lawrence and let me ask him if that is not all in the general interests of the country? Can he point to any increase in the Civil Service that has not been for the general good of Canada? When the hon. gentleman and his friends were in power, they, without developing or improving any branch of the public service, had to borrow year after year large sums of money for which they could show no assets, but simply to run an incompetent government. The hon. gentleman contends that under the present Ministry our credit as a country does not stand so high as it should. He must know that when he and his colleagues were in power, the fact that they had to borrow money simply to keep themselves in office was an injury to the credit of the country. And see what the result has been since the change of Government? Since the advent to power of the present Administration there has been a rapid development of the industries, manufactures and resources of the country, and a reign of general prosperity. Owing to this fact the Government have been enabled to borrow

money on far better terms than their predecessors, and when the hon. gentleman from Ottawa contends that the other colonies of the empire are borrowing money on better terms than Canada he is mistaken. There is no other colony of the empire that has borrowed money in the English market as cheaply as this Dominion.

HON. MR. SCOTT—My hon. friend is mistaken; New South Wales has borrowed on better terms.

HON. MR KAULBACH—New South Wales is the solitary exception, and it has been shown by the hon. gentleman opposite that the loan was obtained under peculiar and exceptional circumstances. The hon. gentleman from Halifax has referred to the general increase in the public debt of Canada. It seems to me, however, that, as far as his own province is concerned, he has been largely instrumental in adding to the public debt, for he has approved of every expenditure that has been made in Nova Scotia. He was a party to this general Omnibus Railway Subsidy bill, referred to by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa, and when it was before the House he raised no objection to it. He must remember that one of the causes of complaint by Nova Scotia against the late Government was that they refused to make any concessions to that province, and I am sure he cannot contend that Nova Scotia has received any public money to which she is not entitled. My hon. friend complains of the Intercolonial Railway; he seems to think that this $20,000,000 added to the public debt is something for which the present Government should be held responsible. The hon. gentleman is evidently an opponent of the Intercolonial Railway, for he has already stated to this House that there should be no deficit; that the road should be run on commercial principles, and that the railway, which was constructed as a political and national enterprise, in the interests of the Dominion, should be run so as to make a profit, and that Nova Scotia should be made responsible for the running of it. If he can make it appear that the Intercolonial Railway could be run in such a way as not only to pay expenses, but to make a profit, what would the people of the Maritime Provinces say to such a proposition? He would find that any Government that would endeavor to run the Intercolonial Railway on such principles would in a short time be hurled from power. In referring to the increase in our public debt the hon. gentleman seems to have forgotten the fact that we have taken Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, Manitoba and the North-West Territory into the Confederation, all of which has caused a large increase in the public debt. Then, with regard to public buildings, my hon. friend cannot say that the money spent in erecting them has been improperly expended. After all his criticism he could only refer to one public building as being an unnecessary waste of money, the post-office in Hull, which the member for Halifax considered was rather too large for a city of that size. I am sure when my hon. friend has to come down to that from his sweeping assertion that there has been extravagance in the erection of public buildings, he has not successfully proved his case when he only refers to one small building across the Ottawa River. My hon. friend knows that every public building erected in the Dominion, especially in Nova Scotia, has been a public benefit. There should be public buildings in every county, and I am surprised that more of them have not been built. For instance, in the town of Lunenburg there should be a substantial post-office building erected for the convenience of the public. When my hon. friend denounces the construction of substantial buildings of this kind, he cannot be doing it in the interests of the country. My hon. friend must be hard up for an argument when he introduces the Short Line Railway into a debate on a question like this. I believe that the Short Line Railway project is before the Government now, and when it comes before Parliament that will be a proper time to enter into a discussion upon it. Then with respect to the Pacific Railway, I do not know what my hon. friend's policy is with regard to it; but he tells us he believes that the troops sent to the North-West to quell the insurrection could have been sent there through the United States. I do not know what greater knowledge or wisdom he would

possess on that question than the Government, or other members of this House. We all know that the experience we had on a previous occasion would not justify us in asking the Government at Washington to allow us to pass our troops through United States territory the second time. We cannot forget that at the time of the Red River troubles, when we tried to pass our troops through the canal at Sault St. Marie, that privilege was refused, and we ought to be thankful that on this occasion we did not require to ask for any such privileges. Then the hon. member proceeded to tell us that all the trouble in the North-West was brought about by the blundering of the Government. I am surprised at my hon. friend attempting in a debate of this kind, to make such an assertion without any evidence whatever to support it. We might as well say that the Grits, the Farmers' Union of the North-West, have been instrumental in bringing about the rebellion, and I believe when the facts come out it will be found to be the case. Everything the Opposition could do to ruin the railway and produce discontent in the North-Wiest they have done. This Farmers' Union is known throughout the length and breadth of the country to be composed of Grits who are antagonistic to the prosperity of the Dominion; therefore, I could with greater justice say that the disturbance in the North-West was brought about by the Grits than my hon. friend can assert that it was due to the blundering of the Government. I do not say so, of course, but my hon. friend has gone far beyond what he had a right to say in making such a statement. The hon. member from Woodstock talks about building the Canadian Pacific Railway six years ahead of the proper time for its completion. Does he not know that it is in the public interest that it should be built as soon as possible in order to prevent the possibility of a recurrence of troubles in the North-West? Does he not know that all the money which has been invested in that great highway will be lost to the country until the line is completed? Does he not know that it is in the interest not only of this Dominion but of the whole Empire to have it completed, and the sooner it is completed the better it will be for the people. Until we have the main line completed and other lines constructed in the North-West we cannot be surprised if the Indians are an aggressive and disturbing element. It is only by opening up that country and encouraging the rapid settlement of the fertile prairies of the west that we can expect to have peace and prosperity prevailing in those remote territories, and I am surprised at the hon. member from Halifax at this time of day endeavoring to attribute the troubles which have unhappily arisen in the North-West, and which we have all felt have been an injury to every province of the Dominion, to misgovernment. From every part of Canada troops have gone forth to suppress the insurrection, and the occasion has demonstrated that in all parts of the Dominion, the people feel that they have a common interest in that great country.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I regret that I was not present to hear the opening remarks of the hon. member from Ottawa. I did not imagine that this resolution, as it was brought before the House, would lead to a general discusssion of the financial condition of the country; otherwise, I should certainly have been in my place, and would have been glad to listen to the statements he made. But I have gathered some of them from what the hon. gentleman has said himself since I entered, and I have heard others referred to by those who supported and those who replied to him. I believe the general course which has been taken by the hon. member and his friends has been, on subjects of this kind, to dwell largely on the alarming increase of the public debt. They have painted in very dark colors the present condition of the country, and have predicted for the Dominion great misfortunes, owing to the probable position in which it would be placed under the constant increase of the debt, and the loss of the public credit. It strikes me that if there is one thing more than another calculated to alarm investors in the public debt, it is the dark colors in which the gentlemen on the other side of the House have habitually painted the prospects of Canada. From my first acquaintance with public life, I have seen, with great regret, that that course has always been pursued by the hon. member and his friends

whenever any discussion came up in which the interests of Canada were involved. The key-note was given by the budget speech of 1874, in which a very able and ingenious man, then intrusted with the management of our finances, devoted the main part of his speech to depicting the unfortunate position of the country and predicting its speedy ruin. I cannot imagine anything which could have been better calculated to alarm the public mind than the statement made by that hon. gentleman on that occasion; it was a period of general depression and disaster, and it was not at all to be wondered at after such a statement, that when the hon. gentleman went to England to negotiate a loan he was compelled to sacrifice the four per cents of Canada at less than 87½ cents on the dollar. He had painted the condition of Canada as being so desperate in order to discredit his predecessors in the Government, that he was compelled to make a sacrifice of 12½ per cent. on the loan of 1876, of £2,500,000, and as compared with the price of the loan of £5,000,000 just completed, a loss of over $1,500,000. That was the difference between the loan made by my hon. friend's Finance Minister and the loan complained of as having been made by the present Finance Minister.

We hear a good deal about the increase of the public debt. There is no doubt about the increase, and it will continue to increase as Canada grows, improves and expands, with the great North-West to be developed, railways to be built through it and other improvements to be made. It is perfectly natural and necessary that the public debt should increase, and whenever the public expenditure ceases to increase then the prosperity of the country will have reached its climax and we will have become a dead instead of a prosperous and progressive people. But we must look at the other side; if the debt increases we get value for it. It is a very one-sided view also to take to say that the yearly expenditure has increased by leaps and bounds. It has increased largely, there is no doubt about that either. When the hon. gentleman opposite came into power the yearly public expenditure was $23,316,316. It has increased from that about $8,000,000 at the present time. A very considerable increase was made during the administration of the gentlemen who held power up to 1878, the Government of which my hon. friend was a member.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Oh no.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Oh yes, I can give the hon. gentleman the figures. There is another thing I can tell him: there was a studied attempt in 1878 to cut down the expenditure for the purpose of making a show before the people, and what was it taken from? From the Militia, $428,000 in one year; from the Public Works, $686,000 in one year. Those were not legitimate economies. Those were savings that had to be made good by subsequent outlay, and the hon. gentleman knows it. He knows that to reduce the militia expenditure in one year from $978,000 to $550,000 was a false economy and had an injurious effect upon the militia organization; that the sudden reduction of the expenditure on public works, chargeable to revenue, from $1,950,000 to $1,262,000, was injurious to the public interests, and was intended to cover extravagance in expenditure elsewhere. If he looks at the Public Accounts he will find that my statement is perfectly correct. Then while the yearly public expenditure has increased with us, there have been large increases on the other side of the account. It must be remembered that if the expenditure on revenue account has increased, it has been mainly in the expenses of running the Intercolonial Railway, in the post office expenditure, and other items of expense connected with public works; but we have been getting an increased revenue from those sources. Of course the general public expenditure will be swollen, but on the other side there is a compensation in an increased revenue. I will not make an exhaustive statement on these matters now. I will take some other time for that purpose when we have a discussion which seems to be more germane to those questions; but I will state that there have been increases in the yearly revenue from customs and excise, since the present Government came into power, of how much does the hon. gentleman think? Nearly $11,000,000 in '82–83, and of $7,000,000 last year. That increase of nearly $32,000,000 in the aggregate, as

compared with the year that the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member went out of power, is stated in the Public Accounts.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I made that statement.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I want to emphasize that statement, and to show that an increase of the public expenditure is an absolute necessity with an increase of revenue. In the Intercolonial Railway there has been an increase of $1,200,000, and of course there must be an increase in the working expenses of that road. The revenue from the Post Office Department has increased by $600,000, and there must be an increase of expenditure in extending the postal service in a young country like ours. In opening up the country the original increase in opening new post offices will far outrun the revenue derived from them. That is a necessity of the country, it cannot be avoided ; it is one of those things upon which no unfavorable criticism can be fairly bestowed. It is not desirable on either side that we should exaggerate those things to the disadvantage of the Government in power and of the country, because every statement of this kind is an attack upon the country. The hon. gentleman has also stated that there has been a vast increase of the public debt. There is an increase in the public debt. It has been stated and contended upon public platforms everywhere by the hon. gentleman's friends, that when this Government was formed the public debt was only $77,000,000, and that it has now increased almost three-fold. What is the use of an argument like that? The debt of $77,000,000 meant the aggregate debt of the provinces ; it did not mean anything that the new Dominion had done or had to do. It did not include the building of the Intercolonial Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, the construction of lighthouses and harbors, the acquisition and development of the North-West, nor meeting the necessities that arose in order to put this Dominion in a position to give it the commercial importance to which it was entitled. There was no blame attachable to anybody for the increase of the public debt. It was a meritorious increase, and not only that, but the hon. gentleman knows that between 1867 and 1874 that increase was justified by the pessimist Finance Minister, who came into power in 1873-74, when he went to London to make his first loan. He stated that the whole public debt of Canada was represented not by the expenses of a cruel war which had left nothing but wreck and bloodshed behind it, but by public works and improvements, all of which he said were value for the amount at which they stood in the Public Accounts, and were not only beneficial to the country but were beneficial to the great empire of which Canada was a part.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—That was the bright side of the shield.

HON. MR. DEVER—That was the right side.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It was the silver side, and the true side. In Canada he showed that there was a brazen side to all this, that his predecessors had wasted the public money and that we had incurred obligations which had brought the country to the verge of ruin. The hon. gentleman will remember that our imminent danger was shown with a great deal more glibness circumstantiality and plausibility then than it is pointed to now by my hon. friends who are criticizing this Bill ; but it is the same tone which runs throughout, the same dark view of things, the same desire in some way or other to belittle the condition of the country, the same apparent intention to create distrust in the minds of the public. Why else does the hon. gentleman compare our loans with the loans of some particular colony in Australia? Why does he attempt to show unpatriotically that we cannot borrow money in the English markets as well as it can be borrowed by some of the Australian colonies? He knows very well that when he makes a quotation of prices in the stock exchange he quotes the retail price where the investor comes in and buys one thousand, or two, or three thousand pounds of bonds. He knows that is not the wholesale price, and that no loan of five or six million pounds can be made at the current price at which stocks

are sold at retail by the brokers in Lombard Street. Every intelligent man knows it who applies his candid common sense to the subject. What are the prices of those stocks? The retail price of Canadian four per cents. in May was 102 to 104, and Australian fours were 99 to 101. That was the retail price. A thousand fluctuations take place in so sensitive an atmosphere as the London money market, as the hon. gentleman knows very well. He knows if a loan had been forced on the English market six weeks ago when there was a prospect of a gigantic war with Russia, when there was a necessity for England to raise an immense amount to meet the expenses of the Egyptian campaign, and when general distrust prevailed throughout the world, that Canada would have been at a great disadvantage and whatever quotations he had of stocks three months before would have been no criterion of the value of a loan which would then be forced on the market. Fortunately it was not necessary to borrow then. Fortunately the cloud of war had been dispersed and the transaction has been made now for Canada on most favorable terms, in spite of the croakings of the Opposition and their attacks upon the Government; in spite of the position which has been taken by the Opposition in the other House; in spite of the endeavor if possible to paralyze the powers of the Government, in view of the large borrowing that was necessary — and necessary, I undertake to say, for purposes which will commend themselves to the people of Canada, however they may be objected to by the minority in both Houses—in spite of all those vaticinations of coming disaster—a loan has been made which redounds to the credit of the country and the astuteness of the Finance Minister, and for which the Government are entitled to the highest credit. He has converted a loan of $25,000,000, now falling due, from five per cent. to four per cent., and instead of selling that four per cent. loan at 87½——

HON. MR. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman is not putting the case fairly. Does he mean to tell me that it is fair to draw a comparison between the position of the market now and the position of the market seven or eight years ago.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Yes, not only perfectly fair, but it is more than that, because there has been a persistent attempt for the last 5 or 7 years to injure and destroy the credit of the country, and the English money market is affected still by rumors of war.

HON. MR. SCOTT—No, no.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I say yes, and my statement will be sustained by every fair-minded man. When the loan was negotiated in 1876 money had been as it has been lately a drug in the market.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Oh no.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The lowest rate of interest had then ruled in the money market of England for months and months, following great stagnation of business and paralysis of trade as it always does—the lowest rate of interest that had ruled for years. I appeal to the commercial men who are still in this House to corroborate what I have stated. At present there is a low rate of interest. All commercial and mercantile transactions are governed very largely by the state of public confidence. There has been a general over-trading; there has been a re-action from that over-trade; there has been a want of confidence, and there has resulted from that an immense piling up of capital in the money centres. Free Trade and Protectionist countries have suffered alike. In New York a rate of interest has ruled for the last year lower than has ever been known in the history of the United States before. My hon. friend who sits directly opposite me (Mr. Ross) who watches commercial transactions throughout the world knows that I am stating what is exactly the case. The rate of interest has been reduced by the Bank of England to 2¼ per cent; in the open market it is as low as one per cent., but it is not upon transactions of this kind which are under consideration. It is upon daily transactions where bankers loan their money upon securities available at any moment to take advantage of any change in the market. There is money

piled up in London by those who are afraid to make any investment. The loan has been negotiated for Canada with its rebellion going on; with a paralysis in its Parliamentary affairs; with a statement that we are ruining ourselves by building the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the statement that we were adding to the public debt in such a way as to largely increase the burdens of the people and make them almost intolerable; in spite of all this we have borrowed $25,000,000 at a better rate than any loan that has yet been made, because we must not judge by the rate of interest to be paid but by the proceeds of the loan. When we speak of a 4 per cent. loan it is very well, but when we know it has been negotiated at 87½, it takes the merit from that transaction very materially. It not only makes a high rate of interest, a rate equal to 5 per cent., but it damages the credit of the country and it does not bring into the treasury the amount of money which we should receive. It increases the debt without giving us the proceeds which it ought to produce. I never have been in favor of making a loan at a large discount. I think it is financially a mistake, and I am very glad that the present Finance Minister has abandoned that idea and made his loan at a rate of interest which brought just about par. I have no doubt the time will come when we will be able to borrow money at less rates. I think that under all the circumstances the country and the Government are to be congratulated that the loan which has lately been effected by Sir Leonard Tilley has been negotiated at so favourable a rate, and I expect the money which is to be borrowed under the resolutions which have given rise to this debate, will be made on equally favorable terms, and I believe it is a meritorious loan for meritorious puposes. I think it is for purposes which we could not have avoided. I do not at all believe in the statements of hon. gentlemen that we have made a mistake in hurrying on the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe that if that railway is to be of any use to the country it should be built as rapidly as engineering skill could construct it. The sooner it is through the better. Everybody knows that the whole of the great west of the United States has been built up by the rapid construction of railways. They did not wait for ten years, and build a hundred miles at a time. They ran their roads through before population had begun to pour into the country. The railway preceded population, it did not follow it. In all cases where the west has been settled up, it has been by the railways preceding population. That is the policy that has been adopted here, and where would we have been in the month of March, and the early part of April, last, if we had listened to the earnest persuasion of the able and eloquent leader of the Opposition, who spent hours in the discussions in 1880-81, upon the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions and contract, trying to show us that it was absolute madness to construct that road round the north shore of Lake Superior. Where would we have been if we had accepted that policy? We would have made the western section of the Canadian Pacific Railway a feeder to the railways of the United States, and once its traffc got there we in the eastern part of Canada would never have heard of it again; it would never have come back to us. And if it had not been for the persistence with which we determined that there should be no railway or that it should be a continuous line through Canada, we would have been perfectly powerless when the red hand of rebellion was raised in the North-West, and it was calculated, cruelly and cooly calculated, that it would be at least two months before troops could be sent through from eastern Canada to suppress that rebellion.

That was the calculation, but, thank heaven, that calculation was defeated—was frustrated by the construction of the road round the north shore of Lake Superior, and, having heard the criticisms on that line, having heard the doubt expressed as to whether the work was going on in good faith, I must confess that I was greatly surprised when I found that even with the inadequate means that the road then possessed it was able to transport troops from Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa within the space of one week to Winnipeg, and thence sent forward to the seat of war. And the rebels and those concerned in the rebellion—not only the rebels themselves, but the men who stood

behind them chuckling over the possibility that the great North-West would be lost to Canada, were greatly disappointed and greatly surprised when they heard the news of the arrival of the troops in Winnipeg, and those who had encouraged the rising skulked back to their homes, and I trust before the investigation is over we shall find them and brand them as they deserve. To show how very loosely statements are made in this House, I shall refer to one statement that was made in my hearing while the discussion was going on here. A gentleman who is less noted for the accuracy of his figures than the animus that inspires his attacks, and who is not now in the House, and to whom I will not reply when the question of accuracy is concerned, talked of the Intercolonial Railway and the cost of it being $38,000,000, and a voice on the other side—the amiable voice of my hon. friend the senior member from Halifax, that supplemented that statement by saying the cost of the Intercolonial Railway was $40,000,000. We have nothing to go by except the public accounts. Our imaginations are not allowed to travel outside of the record when we wish to state facts and figures. The public accounts, if the hon. gentleman will choose to look at them, will show that the expenditure on capital account instead of being $40,000,000 is $29,486,027, a trifling difference of only $11,000,000; but that does not amount to anything when statements of this kind are being made for the purpose of influencing public opinion. Such statements are made at hap hazard, without reference to the figures and, *ab uno disce omnes*, when you hear a hazardous statement like that, it is difficult to place faith in any statements of figures when made by gentlemen who, to say the least, are so inexact in a statement which is so easily verified as this. The public debt in 1873-74, when the late Government came into power, was $119,000,000. The net debt in 1879 was $143,000,000, an increase of $24,000,000, with very little to show for it except in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. Very little money had been spent upon the Pacific Railway, and that which was expended was not expended to the credit of the First Minister of the country at that time. It was spent very much to his discredit, and I do not hesitate to say so. I happened to be chairman of the committee which investigated the expenditure between Red River and Fort William; I was able to show to the country that the construction of sections of that road was begun without surveys, without estimates, without knowledge of the country, without knowledge of the route upon which the road was to be located, without knowledge of the terminus at which it was to end at Red River. I was able to show that estimates were made and contracts were based upon assumed quantities where there had never been a quantity ascertained or a railway engineer upon the ground on which these imaginary quantities were stated; and upon those quantities being moneyed out a general statement of the cost of the road was made, which was as fallacious as the quantities themselves. I was able to show that the First Minister, in appealing to the country in 1877 and 1878, said he was building the section, from Fort William to Red River at half the cost of the Intercolonial Railway, for $24,500 a mile, upon absolutely baseless data; he never had a survey; he knew nothing of what the cost would be, and instead of $24,500 a mile that he calculated upon, it cost nearly $40,000 a mile, and I can show the hon. gentleman incontrovertible proof of every word I am stating. That was the kind of expenditure which increased the public debt up to 1879. In one single contract there was an increase in the earthworth from 80,000 cubic yards estimated, up to the time I investigated it, to nearly 1,600,000 cubic yards, and it was not then nearly finished; that contract was made at 37 cents a cubic yard. There were only 80,000 yards called for under the contract, and when we investigated the matter there were nearly 1,600,000 cubic yards done, and over 1,200,000 yards of ordinary earthworth to be done before the contract was completed. That was on contract 15. On section 14 the engineers had never been at the end where the contractors commenced work; they had only been over some 13 miles of the east end of the road. That contract was moneyed out at $400,000, and when I investigated it, it had cost

$770,000, and was not at that time completed. That was the way in which the public debt was increased between 1874 and 1879; it is a sample of the kind of railway building we had under the late Government. The same thing happened on the Georgian Bay Branch; there never was an engineer over that road before it was contracted for by the late Mr. Foster. The engineer stated that he had not been within many miles of the track, and knew nothing about the line. At the terminus of contract 14 on Red River, if the line had been diflected less than five miles from where it was located, would have saved the Government $360,000. Mr. Mackenzie was on the committee, and the late Thomas Oliver was on the committee. The whole of these facts were brought out before the committee, and the report was made. Those gentlemen dissented from the report, but they were present on the investigation, and the facts were brought out, and could not be gainsaid. That expenditure formed part of the public debt from 1874 to 1879. I did not intend to refer to it, I have done so only by way of vindicating the present Government from the charge of unnecessarily increasing the public debt. Now what has been the cause of the increase since 1879? I may say that the expenditure on capital account has been far larger than the increase of the debt. During the period from 1874 to 1879 the increase of the debt was larger than the expenditure on capital account, which was owing to the fact that there was a deficit every year, and that deficit had to be made up by borrowing money; but since 1879 there has been a surplus which has been expended very largely in the construction of works properly chargeable to capital account. The debt as it stood on the 1st of July last, for we have no other reliable data except the general statements that have been made with respect to the increase of the debt, was $182,000,000. The reduction of interest has very largely relieved the public from the burden of that increased debt. There has been a reduction of one half of one per cent. nearly in the general rate of interest paid upon the whole public debt.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I drew attention to that fact.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I am very glad that the hon. gentleman did so; it is consistent with his usual candour in dealing with those matters. It is one of those things that cannot be ignored in a discussion of the public debt, and I say again that that reduction in the rate of interest has been made in spite of, not aided by Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. It has been made by the sheer force of the real prosperity, growth and credit of Canada, in spite of all the attacks that have been made on our public credit—attacks that have been made upon it through the Canadian Pacific Railway; through the North-West where there has been a constant endeavor to persuade the world that that country has been so badly administered that the people were upon the eve of revolution everywhere, and the wish was father to the thought, and the thought has been father largely to bringing about the very state of affairs which has been predicted by enemies of the Government. The increase of our debt has been from $143,000,000, to $182,000,000—that is an increase of $39,000,000. That money has gone largely into the Pacific Railway. This Government pledged itself to construct the Pacific Railway. The people twice endorsed by a large majority the policy of the Government. The Government stand supported by a large majority of the representatives of the people in that policy. The amount provided for in these resolutions that come up to us is partly made up by sums that have been spent on the Pacific Railway, and are still to be spent on it, has a sanction of a large majority of the House of Commons—the money giving power—the immediate representatives of the people. That policy has been endorsed; that policy has been pursued, and I venture to say, in spite of all the adverse criticisms of the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, that policy will meet with the acceptance of the country, and will continue to be the policy of the country whoever may be in power. I do not believe, if the hon. gentleman and his friends went into power to-morrow, that they would venture to stop the building of the road. They dare not do so; they would have to go on with it, and to be in accord with the feelings of the country, it should be built speedily upon the principle of *bis dat qui*

cito dat—he who gives a benefit to the country should give it quickly and thereby double its advantages. Population is pouring into the west on the American side below the line. We ought to give equal facilities; we have had no opportunity yet to show what the capacity of our road is, and if the hon. gentleman will read the exhaustive statement that was made by the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway at the meeting of the shareholders on the 13th of this month—if he will read it with the candour which characterizes him, he will see that our course has been the correct and the proper one. It is childish to talk of a burden of seven or eight million of dollars a year being thrown on the country for the maintenance of that road. The position of the Pacific Railway from the 1st of January to the 1st of May last, as compared with the previous year, is $950,000 better. In Winnipeg alone so great has been the prospect of business that the company have put in 21 miles of siding. They have not made it for the purpose of empty show, but to accommodate the business that they expect to get, and they will get it, and if it had not been for this unfortunate insurrection in the North-West, which will, no doubt, eventually redound to the benefit of that country, we would now see that road loaded with traffic. I say that the money expended on the Canadian Pacific Railway contract by the country, has been well expended—as well expended as if every dollar had been watched by special expert agents of the Government. I have in my possession photographs of all the principal works on the road, and I say that there is no better work on this continent than that on the Canadian Pacific Railway. The absurd statement was made here that there was a grade of 250 feet to the mile in the mountain section of that road, and 5 miles of tunnel. Such a statement is worthy of the hon. gentleman from whom it emanated. One can hardly call the man a gentleman, who deliberately makes such a statement, but I suppose he must have quoted from the atrocious and absurd pamphlet attacking the road, published anonymously last autumn, where such a statement was made by the author, who writes as an engineer, but evidently cannot belong to that profession. The facts are, that in order to connect the east and west line for construction trains, the contractors built a temporary track of 5 miles at any grade—250 feet, or any grade or curve on which they could operate a locomotive for the time being, while a tunnel in the direct line of some 2,200 feet was constructed. It was seized upon by the hon. gentleman in question, who stated here, and spread through the reports, that there were grades of 250 feet to the mile on the Pacific Railway, and a 5-mile tunnel to be built on the Canadian Pacific Railway. This shows the nature of the attacks which have been made on that great enterprise. Now, I will say that the Bill which has been brought here has been sanctioned by the other House, the money-giving power with which we are associated. I say that the resolutions on which it is founded are for purposes which will commend themselves to the judgment of the country at this moment, and will bear the closest criticism and scrutiny. I challenge that scrutiny, and I challenge that criticism. It is too late now to make the further remarks, which I intend to make at some other time, with respect to the financial position of the country, and when the opportunity offers I trust I may be pardoned for going into it at some greater length, and then I trust I will be able to show that whatever our debt may be we have got good value for it—we have got that which will bring us a great deal more than we shall pay out in the way of interest. We have got that which is to be the making of our country, and but for the indomitable perseverance of those who have been our leaders, and of him who we are told we obey as the sheep obey the bell-wether—but for the indomitable perseverance of our leaders, the project would have been abandoned in despair on account of the persistent opposition which has been given to it from the time of its inception.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I challenge my hon. friend's statement that it was not fair to draw a comparison between Sir Richard Cartwright raising a loan in 1876, and Sir Leonard Tilley's loan in 1885. I said that the value of money was entirely different in both cases, and therefore it was not a fair standard. I sent out for a paper to

get the value of American 4's to-day, and I find they are quoted at 120; in 1877 their 4½ per cents. were only worth 104¼. What I said was, it was not a fair argument that was used because the value of money to-day is not what it was in 1876, and in proof of that I could quote to you the Consuls of the various countries of Europe, and of the various States which are more akin to ours, and which show that their 4's have risen 20 per cent., and we have shared in the general prosperity and in the general reduction of interest. I drew attention to that in my remarks—that it was one of the great blessings that Canada had the advantage of; that Canada was paying less for its public debt and therefore we were in a position to borrow more now than we could if we were paying larger interest.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—When the hon. gentleman quotes American fours, he will remember that the United States Government had been for a long time under suspension; that the period when their 4 per cents. were low was a period when they were emerging from their position as a non-specie-paying country, and when they were still suffering from the result of that suspension, and the prosperity of the country had not counteracted it fully. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to another fact; there cannot be properly any comparison between the prices of Canadian stocks and those of the United States, and I tell the hon. gentleman one great reason. There is a general banking law in the United States which compels all the banks issuing circulation, to deposit securities of the United States with the public treasury for the security of that circulation. That Act which is now in full operation has made a constant demand for United States securities and keeps up the price. There are $327,000,000 of United States bonds in deposit in the banking department at Washington for the security of the issues of the banks of the United States, and there is a constant demand for those securities for that purpose, and we cannot therefore compare the price of the bonds of Canada and the United States, because this is an element in the calculation which throws it entirely out. I find that at the time the negotiation was made by Sir Richard Cartwright in 1876, the rate of interest in the Bank of England was 2 per cent., and that it remained at 2 per cent. for a long time, and he sold the 4 per cents. of Canada for 87½ or less. That is a sufficient answer to my hon. friend's argument as to the comparison between the two loans. That is an absolute fact; I stated on the floor of the House of Commons that the fours of '76 did not net over 87½, and I challenged Sir Richard Cartwright to show that he got more than 87½. I showed the figures, and I said, "If I am wrong the hon. gentleman is here to correct me."

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read the second time without debate, on the understanding that they would be explained in committee:—

Bill (183), "An Act further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act 1882." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

Bill (119), "An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

ENTRIES IN BOOKS OF ACCOUNT KEPT BY OFFICERS OF THE CROWN BILL.

COMMONS AMENDMENTS AGREED TO.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the amendments made by the House of Commons to the Bill, "An Act respecting Proof of Entries in Books of Account kept by Officers of the Crown," be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to, and the amendments were concurred in.

The Senate adjourned at six o'clock.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Wednesday, June 17th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock p. m.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills, reported from the Committee on Banking and Commerce, without amendment, were read the third time and passed without debate :—

Bill (105), "An Act respecting the Bank of British Columbia." (Sir Alex. Campbell).

Bill (117), "An Act respecting the Commercial Bank of Windsor." (Sir Alex. Campbell).

A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

HON. MR. POWER—Before the orders of the day are called I wish to say a word as to a matter personal to myself. In the course of the debate yesterday on the Loan Bill, I made a statement with respect to the cost of the Intercolonial Railway, which the hon. gentleman from Niagara said was incorrect. I was not present at the time the hon. gentleman made the statement, but I understood that he said that the total cost of the road up to date was only $29,000,000. I beg to refer the hon. gentleman to the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals for the year ending on the 30th June last. At page 16 of that report he will find that it is stated that the total cost of the road and equipment chargeable to capital account, at the close of the fiscal year 1882-83, according to last year's report, was $41,067,252 ; the expenditure charged to capital account for the year ending 1884, was $1,514,979, making a total cost up to 30th June, 1884, of $42,582,231.

HON. MR. PLUMB—How much of that was before Confederation?

HON. MR. POWER—None before Confederation.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I gave the amounts from the Public Accounts as expended on capital account. Whatever previous expenditure there had been we were not talking about; we were discussing the increase of the public debt since Confederation. There were roads taken in, and the cost of those roads was added.

HON. MR. POWER—My statement was that the total cost of the Intercolonial Railway had been about $42,000,000.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The statement that I heard from the hon. gentleman was simply a supplementary remark to a statement made on this side of the House, and I heard the hon. gentleman use the words "forty millions of dollars." I had the Public Accounts in my hands which stated the amount charged to capital account for the Intercolonial Railway. I know nothing about any previous charges; I only took those that were made as applying to the time we were discussing. We were discussing the finances of the Dominion and the Dominion debt, and the whole argument had reference to the increase of the Dominion debt.

HON. MR. DEVER—I think the hon. gentleman will find that what swells up the amount is the purchase of the Grand Trunk Railway portion of the road.

HON. MR. POWER—I have a great deal of respect for the hon gentleman's authority on the subject, but I take it that the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals as to the total cost of the Intercolonial Railway is more reliable than any made up by the hon. gentleman from Niagara.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I am not making any statement, I am taking the Public Accounts. It is not my statement in any sense. He will find on page 17 of the supplementary statements of the Public Accounts that the total sum represented by the expenditure on capital account for the Intercolonial Railway is $29,486,02—and not to put too fine a point upon it, 90 cents.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—At what date?

HON. MR. PLUMB—The year ended 30th June, 1883-84—the last statement of the Public Accounts.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It must include the branch from Riviere du Loup to Point Levis.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Perhaps the Minister of Justice can explain how it is that there is such a difference between the statement of the Minister of Railways and the Public Accounts?

THE SPEAKER—Orders of the day.

AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (122), "An Act respecting Agricultural Fertilizers." He said—This is a Bill to introduce some regularity and thoroughness in the sale of agricultural fertilizers. The Bill proposes that every manufacturer or importer of fertilizers shall send a sample to the Inland Revenue Department, and these samples shall be examined. The inspector shall go once a year to the manufacturer and see that the samples which are being sent to the Department agree with the material which the man is selling. A certificate shall be placed on each package which the man sells, whether it be a barrel or a smaller parcel, stating that it contains so and so, and the public will know that the man is selling fertilizers, the component parts of which are stated on the certificate on the outside of the package. It provides for the examination by an inspector once a year, or oftener if necessary, of the materials which the man is selling and imposing certain penalties for a wilful departure from the terms of the Act. In this as in the other Bill we discussed a few nights ago, it is proposed that a variation of less than one per cent. is not material. I think the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Haythorne) who took part in the discussion on that Bill and raised that question came ultimately to the conclusion that one per cent. was not an unfair limit. In this Bill the provision is given with more particularity. It provides that a deficiency of one *per centum* of the ammonia or its equivalent of nitrogen, or of the phosphoric acid, claimed to be contained, shall not be considered as evidence of fraudulent intent. That seemed not to be an unreasonable limit. If we find it necessary we can discuss that when we come to consider the Bill in a Committee of the whole House.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I have looked into this Bill, being myself interested in agriculture, and having been in the habit of using this description of goods, and I think the Bill is a very useful and necessary one. As agriculture improves in this country, farmers will see the necessity of adopting artificial fertilizers, because everyone engaged in that pursuit knows how difficult it is to furnish a sufficient quantity of manure from the farm yard and otherwise. He finds with all his best efforts it is impossible for him to do so. Here are articles offered for sale which are well calculated to remedy this deficiency. Another advantage is that a new industry is springing up amongst us, particularly in the vicinity of this city, that is mining phosphates. Now these phosphates contain the fertilizing element which is so frequently deficient in our fields, particularly after they have been for some time under cultivation. When using artificial fertilizers it is most essential that the farming community should be defended against impositions. Nothing is more easy than to adulterate those fertilizers, and perhaps in the present state of the trade in Canada there is nothing to prevent farmers being imposed upon unless a measure of this sort is placed upon the Statute Books. It is different in England. The farmers there have the means of defending themselves without a law. Their system is this; a dealer furnishes a buyer with a sample and engages that the bulk of what he supplies shall be of equal quality. If the farmer finds that the results which he expected from the fertilizer are inadequate, he can take a sample to an analyst and if it does not come up to the sample on which the sale was made he can prosecute the dealer. That protection, and the desire of dealers to make a good reputation, are amply sufficient, but it is different here where everything is new and imperfectly understood. It is quite right in this

country that Parliament should step in with a law of this description to protect the interests of the farmer. I agree with all the clauses of the Bill except that one which renders it unnecessary for a sample sent for analysis to contain exactly the quantity guaranteed. I was under the impression, when I saw the clause at first, that the percentage was too large, but my hon. friend who sits near me showed me my mistake on that point. Although I do not now believe that any such reduction is necessary, still it is so comparatively small that I am not disposed to object to the Bill on that ground.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—How are the analysts to be paid. ?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is an analyst in chief here who is paid by the Government. I do not know what deputies he may have.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Are they paid by fees ?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The inspectors are, but the analyst here is an officer of the Department, and is paid by salary.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole on Bill (133) "An Act further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882.'

In the Committee,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL explained that the object of the first section was to provide for a 4th class of engineers.

The clause was adopted.

On the 2nd clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL explained that section 48 of the Steamboat Inspection Act was amended by leaving out the word "marine." It had been found that there were not many marine steam engine shops. On the St. Lawrence and the great lakes there are no marine steam engine shops, the marine steam engine not being the kind used for the most part on the ordinary steamboats navigating inland waters. It was proposed to re-enact the clause leaving out the word "marine." That would give the person employed all the knowledge neces sary for running the engines ordinarily used on the lake and river craft.

The clause was adopted.

On the 3rd clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL explained that the object of the clause was to amend the 45th section of the Steamboat Inspection Act by adding a sub-section, making the same provision with reference to the new class of engineers as already existed in the Act with reference to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd class engineers.

The clause was adopted.

HON. MR. GIRARD, from the Committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

The Bill was then read the 3rd time and passed

INSPECTION OF GAS AND GAS METERS BILL.

THIRD READING

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (119), "An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters."

In the Committee,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said : This Bill consists of only one clause, the object of which is to provide that where the quality of gas is to be inspected, notice need not be given to the person who manufactures it. In the Act, as it now stands, the inspector is obliged to give notice to the manufacturer that he will at such a day be in attendance for

the purpose of inspecting the quality of the gas. It has turned out in practice, as one might imagine, that that is not the right way to ascertain the quality of the gas—that when the inspector goes, after having given 24-hours notice, he finds the gas good, although the quality might not have been good 24 hours before that.

HON. MR. VIDAL, from the committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

The Bill was then read the third time and passed.

COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION, LONDON, BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (126), "An Act to provide for the fitting representation of Canada at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, to be held in London in the year 1886."

In the committee,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I promised at the last stage of the Bill to give some information to the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island, who asked for an explanation as to the nature of the assistance to be given to exhibitors who propose to send articles to the exhibition. I have asked for the information and it has been given to me as follows:—

The mode proposed to assist intending exhibitors at the "Colonial Indian Exhibition," to be held in London in 1886, consists of paying the freight of all exhibits, whether manufactured or natural products, such as shall be accepted, to London, the placing of such exhibits in position, and returning them back to their owners in Canada at the cost of the Government, in the event of their not being sold by the order or agent of the owners.

The Government also undertakes to see that proper care is taken of all exhibits during the exhibition; but all perishable articles are to be at the risk of the owners, as well as generally any damage incident to carriage or exposure in exhibition. These terms have been generally accepted as being exceedingly liberal.

Agents are employed to collect the exhibits. There are three for the province of Ontario: Messrs. R. W. Wright, R. Pringle and Alex. Leith; two for the Province of Quebec: Messrs. S. C. Stevenson and L. Desjardins; in the Maritime Provinces: Mr. W. F. Best and Mr. W. D. Demock; also one in British Columbia: Mr. J. Jessup. These agents have been actively going out to collect exhibits, and have so far met with success.

These are the provisions which the Government are making to assist the exhibitors on the occasion in question. I hope my hon. friend will consider them satisfactory. The whole guarantee will be £50,000, and as £10,000 is to £50,000, so will this country have to pay in case there is a loss at the exhibition; but the past history of those exhibitions shows that the danger of loss is very small, and in this instance, I hope, instead of a loss there will be a gain.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—When are those articles for exhibition required to be prepared?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL — I am not able to state that, but due notice of it will be given. I have not yet got the information. Some of those gentlemen whose names I have mentioned as being employed as agents, are now in town, and they will shortly lay the information before the Government. Ample notice will be given, however, to those who intend to exhibit, to allow them time to send their exhibits forward.

HON. MR. KAULBACH — Did I understand the Minister of Justice to say that by this Bill Canada is acting in concert with India and the other colonies to guarantee against a loss?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes; India guarantees £20,000, Canada £10,000, and the other colonies of the Empire guarantee £20,000, making the total guarantee £50,000

HON. MR. POWER, from the Committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

The Bill was read the third time and passed.

The Senate adjourned at 4 o'clock, p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, June 18th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (122), "An Act respecting Agricultural Fertilizers."

In the committee,

On the 5th clause,

HON. MR. POWER—I notice that this clause makes provision for an analysis by the chief analyst. The committee will remember that when we had under consideration the Bill with respect to the adulteration of food, we found in it a provision that the analysis of articles obtained for the purposes of examination should be first made by the local analyst. I presume there is good reason for not adopting that course in the present instance; but the Minister will probably tell us why it is that the same provision is not contained in this Bill? It would save expense and delay if the importer or manufacturer, say in Nova Scotia or British Columbia, were allowed to have the articles analyzed by the analyst on the spot, and not compelled to send them to the Capital for an analysis.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—In the case of food, the natural course would be to have the analysis on the spot where it is sold, but in the case of these fertilizers they want a sample here so that sales may take place in all parts of the country on the strength of the analysis made here. The Bill provides in a subsequent clause that the man who vends it shall put a stamp on the package showing what it is composed of, and if he sells any preparation that is not up to his own mark, or up to the mark of the public analysist, he shall be liable to a penalty. The scheme here seems to be to have the samples all sent to the headquarters for analysis; but in the case of food it would be useless as it might spoil on the way.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The chief analyst is paid by salary instead of by fees?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—In that case it would save the party having the analysis made the expense of fees?

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I myself prefer the analysis of the head officer, though it may cause a little more delay.

HON. MR. POWER—I presume the difficulty is met in the 3rd clause, which provides that the manufacturer or importer shall himself furnish a certificate of analysis. That certificate goes to the department, and is presumed to be reliable until the chief analyst finds out that it is otherwise. I see that the importer or manufacturer is allowed to sell from the beginning, so that there can be no objection to it.

The clause was adopted.

On the 12th clause,

HON. MR. POWER—The Minister will notice in this clause there is no room for doubt as to the meaning of the one per cent. It says here one per cent. of ammonia, or its equivalent, nitrogen or phosphoric acid. In the Bill that went down to the other House lately there was a question whether it was one per cent. of the whole, or one per cent. of each ingredient.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, I thought however it was clear enough that it was one per cent. of each ingredient.

The clause was adopted.

HON. MR. NELSON, from the committee, reported the Bill with amendments, which were concurred in.

The Bill was then read the third time and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (135), "An Act further to amend 'the General Inspection Act, 1874,' and the Acts amending the same." (Sir Alex. Campbell).

The Senate adjourned at 3.45, p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Friday, June 19th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

AN ADJOURNMENT.

MOTION.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B. C.) moved that when the House adjourns to-day it do stand adjourned until Thursday, the 2nd of July.

HON. MR. POWER — We ought to have some expression of opinion on this motion from the Minister of Justice.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I would ask the Minister of Justice whether it would be safe for the Senate to take so long a recess? Of course it is well known that the week after next there will be two holidays, the 29th June and the 1st of July. If there is nothing next week which is pressing upon the Senate or likely to come up from the other House, I suppose there would not be any great objection to the motion of my hon. friend. If business were coming up from the House of Commons, it might be unfortunate if the Senate were not in session. There are none of us, but are more or less inconvenienced owing to the length of the session. If without interfering in any way with the public business or taking any hazard, such an adjournment can take place, although it is not my habit to advocate such adjournments, (and I do not advocate this) I certainly should be very glad to consent to it, more for the convenience of others than for my own. Perhaps the hon. Minister will give us an idea as to what the effect of an adjournment will be on the public business.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I think that there is hardly a member in this House on either side that would want to adjourn if the hon. the leader of the House objected to it at all, because he has the confidence, I believe, of both sides so entirely, that if he were to say that he wanted us to remain here we would do so. But I think the mover of this motion spoke to the leader of the House before he proposed it—in fact I know he did—and when there is no objection on the part of the Minister of Justice, I cannot see why there should be any objection on the part of other members of the House.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is no prospect that we will have any business before us for several days. I have a note in my hand from an official of the House of Commons to say so. The other branch of the Legislature will be engaged chiefly on the Franchise Bill, the Estimates and the Bill to give assistance to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Whether they may or may not make sufficient progress in any of these matters to send them before this House within the time for which my hon. friend proposes to adjourn, is still a matter of doubt. Perhaps it would be more prudent not to make the adjournment so long, but to come here on Wednesday or Thursday of next week. We might perhaps have business for a couple of days, and then this day week my hon. friend might move to adjourn over the two holidays. The objection to that is, that there would be two adjournments, and it would prevent those who live at a distance from the capital from going to their homes. It is a matter that I must leave in the hands of the House; I do not think that any injury would result to the public business from the proposed adjournment.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER — I feel impelled to offer one or two observations respecting this proposed adjournment. If a majority of this House desire to adjourn I am sure it would be most unseemly for any member to object to their wishes. I do not remember on any occasion having

offered an objection to what I conceived to be the desire of the House, but if we have nothing to do after we have been here four and a half months, I want to know who is chargeable with this waste of time and grave inconvenience to which we are subjected? Here we are, 77 gentlemen from different parts of the Dominion, men who have most important interests at home, and we are detained here week after week and month after month, without any progress in the work of legislation.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I rise to a question of order. I do not think it is in order for the hon. gentleman to bring an accusation of this kind against the House of Commons.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—I ask why it is we are to be detained here? (Order, order). I trust the Speaker will rule upon the question of order.

THE SPEAKER—Great latitude is allowed in discussions of this kind, and although the hon. member is arraigning the members of the House of Commons, I do not know that I am justified in stopping him.

HON MR. ALEXANDER—Whence does it arise that we have been detained here all this time but from the crooked work of the Government, of which the hon. gentleman here is one of the leaders? Whence is it but that the representatives of the people in the House of Commons have been obliged to express the indignation which has been felt by the public with regard to the legislation that has been brought in, to subvert the power of the people. I have no doubt that the Government will go on as they have been doing while they have a majority in both branches of Parliament that will permit them to continue such a course. They possess a majority in the Commons, and they avail themselves of that majority to bring in measures that will destroy the Conservative party. I am a Conservative, and I am proud that I remain one, but I am ashamed of many of the acts of the Conservative leaders which must sully the reputation of that party for a long period of time. But I have every faith that men will spring up, in both branches of Parliament who will raise their voices against those wicked, and crooked ways, and bring about a more upright administration of the public affairs of so promising a country.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I must say I think these frequent adjournments are exceedingly objectionable, and, besides that, they are very unfair. Gentlemen who reside in the immediate neighborhood of the capital can go to their homes and can make arrangements for the progress of their business while others who live at a distance are unable to take advantage of the adjournment at all. Now, from a public point of view, I consider that not a single day ought to be lost at this period of the session. Suppose any of the measures on which the House of Commons are now engaged should come before this House next week, it is clear that if we adjourn to the second of July several days will be lost, and the probability will be that we will be crowded with work when we meet again, yet risks are to be run and inconvenience encountered in order that some members may get home while others have to remain here under expense.

HON. MR. McINNES (B.C.)— I do not think that the last charge of the hon. gentleman can apply to the mover of this adjournment. I do not think it is possible for me to avail myself of this adjournment to get home, but I really think that it is very much better we should have an adjournment of considerable length than to be meeting here for a short time each day. If I had any idea that it would retard the public business of the country or prolong the session in the slightest degree, I should be the last to move for an adjournment, but I think there will be ample time after we meet again to give full consideration to all business that is likely to come before us, and those who live within easy reach of the capital can go home while those whose homes are too distant can take a trip for a week or so from the capital to enjoy themselves in other portions of the Dominion.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I desire to say one word in answer to the hon. member from Prince Edward Island, who is always reasonable, and I should be

very loathe to take any course which my hon. friend on reflection would consider a wrong one; but what can the House do? There is no business before us, and I have read a memorandum from an official of the House of Commons to say that there is not likely to be any for some days to come. No good is to be accomplished by rejecting the motion. The fault may be with the Government or it may be with the Opposition, but no good can be at tained by keeping the House in session. What would my hon. friend have?

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Work.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—If I could give my hon. friend work I would not suggest for a moment that the House should adjourn. The hon. member who offered the motion prefaced it by saying that if he had any idea there would be work to be done he would not make it. It is not the fault of this House that there is no work before us. We are ready to take up bills from the Lower House supposing they do come. But supposing we were here Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, we would have none. Then comes St. Peter and St. Paul's day on Monday, and Dominion Day on Wednesday. There seems to be no object in opposing the motion, and I do not understand that we could accomplish any good if we met the views of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island.

The motion was agreed to

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (135), "An Act further to amend 'the General Inspection Act, 1874,' and the Acts amending the same." He said: This Bill, which relates to the inspection of wheat and fish and other articles which are mentioned in the Bill is an amendment of an Act which already exists, which Act was passed in 1874. Of course during those years experience has shown that amendments are necessary, and this experience has resulted in this that under the Act as it now stands the inspection of fish and hides is compulsory in districts in which inspectors have been appointed. In respect of all other articles, flour, grain, beef, pork, butter, pot and pearl ashes, the inspection is optional.

While the department has had no evidence whatever brought before it from 1874 to the present time, indicating that the law, in respect of those articles whose inspection is not compulsory, has failed fully to meet the requirements of trade, there has been a never-ceasing correspondence in respect of the articles of fish and hides, and although amendments have been made, year after year in reference to the views of those most interested, the Act still does not give public satisfaction.

While it is believed that a proper inspection is very desirable, and, while I am free to admit that the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax has expressed its views in favor of continuation of compulsory inspection, it is impossible not to see in the correspondence before the Department a very strong argument in favor of providing the machinery for inspection, but leaving individual traders free to avail themselves of it or not, as their interests may dictate. The amendments proposed, therefore, dispose of the last vestige of compulsory inspection.

One of the main difficulties in respect of the inspection of fish has been the provision that no inspector, or deputy inspector, should deal in the article he inspects under heavy penalties. It has been found to be practically impossible, under those conditions, to find deputy inspectors throughout a long coast-line, where almost every man is a fisherman.

The amendments proposed do not interfere with these restrictions as to inspectors, as it is still deemed that they should be men not pecuniarily interested in the articles they inspect, but it is proposed that deputy inspectors, appointed not by the Government, but by the inspectors themselves, and responsible to them, may be appointed, even though engaged in the trade, and may inspect and brand their own articles provided they are signed with their name and office, as "Deputy Inspector and Owner."

It is thought that, inspection being optional, it will be availed of only when the inspection has, from the reputation

of the deputy inspector or inspector, a commercial value, as a guarantee, and that an owner who is also a deputy inspector will not injure the reputation of his brand as such for a mere present advantage.

Secondly—A provision has also been made for the appointment of a chief inspector of any of the articles named in the Act. It is not intended to ask any vote for the repayment of such chief inspector, but, if it should be determined that the services of such an officer would tend to a more uniform administration of the Act, such one of the inspectors as may be recommended by the trade would be appointed chief without any further emolument than the Act itself provides for in the way of fees for re-inspection.

A further provision is made for the meeting of delegates from the different commercial centres, with a view to select annually specific samples of grain, to assist different inspectors in grading grains they are called upon to inspect. This Board will meet in Toronto every fall.

I understand that the members of Parliament from Nova Scotia for the most part do not think that the inspection of fish should be compulsory. The inspection of other things for which the Bill provides, wheat, etc., is pretty much as it is now. The Bill, however, makes some difference, I believe, in regard to the weight which should constitute a bushel of each kind of grain. It is intended that the inspector of fish in Halifax will be made a chief inspector in that part of the country for fish, and that the inspector at Toronto will be made a chief inspector there for grain and other articles, the other officers remaining as they are, so it is not apprehended that any additional expense will be incurred. Sub-section 6 of clause 11 provides for the reference of a dispute between an owner of goods and an inspector, or deputy inspector, to the chief inspector, and some provision is made as to the costs and charges for so doing. In clause 36, the weights of spring and other varieties of wheat are given. These, I believe, vary a little from the present provisions in that respect. These I shall be able to explain in committee. If the House would consent to it, I would ask that the Bill be read the second time now, and referred to a committee of the whole House at once.

Hon. MR. HOWLAN—Did I understand the Minister of Justice to say that the inspection is not to be compulsory?

Hon. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

Hon. MR. HOWLAN—That is a new feature of the Bill.

Hon. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, as regards hides and fish.

Hon. MR HOWLAN—I consider it a bad feature.

Hon. MR. POWER—Perhaps it would not be well to refer the Bill to a committee of the whole House now. Hon. gentlemen like my hon. friend from Alberton and others might like to consider what those they represent think about the Bill. With respect to the Chamber of Commerce at Halifax, the Bill in its original form, as introduced in the House of Commons, was submitted to the Chamber of Commerce, and all its provisions received their unqualified approval except the one which made inspection purely voluntary. I believe the Chamber of Commerce were unanimous in thinking that it would be unwise to make that change at present. While I am individually somewhat disposed to agree with the provision in the Bill, still I think that as that body has more to do with the dealing in fish than any other body in the Dominion, it might be as well possibly not to pass that clause which does away with the compulsory inspection of fish, but let the Bill pass with all the amendments except that one.

Hon. MR. KAULBACH—There is a difference of opinion in Nova Scotia as to whether inspection should be compulsory or not. I think in the county from which I come the merchants are in favor of it. Fish sent to the West Indies should be inspected. I think it would be well to accept the suggestion of the hon. member from Halifax and let that clause stand.

Hon. MR. HAYTHORNE—I quite concur in the remarks of the hon. member from Halifax respecting the inadvisability of proceeding with this Bill in committee to-day. It is a very important measure and one which ought to be thoroughly

looked into before it is adopted. Boards of trade and other bodies of that sort can always have their views represented, but there are other classes which can only make themselves heard through their representatives in Parliament, and they ought to have ample opportunity to study this clause and mature their opinions upon it. I see several weights of different grains in this Bill with which perhaps I could not exactly agree, and besides the farmers, there are also the fishermen who are interested in this Bill. I know in the local legislatures, experimental legislation has been attempted for many years—about as long as I can recollect—upon fish inspection there, and rarely if ever has that legislation given general satisfaction, and therefore I think we need to be exceedingly cautious before we adopt anything here rashly.

HON. MR. WARK—When the question of the inspection of fish was under discussion here before, I stated that I was satisfied that no inspection of fish would be any good, because it depends altogether on the character of the men who put up the fish. I have seen a barrel of fish opened that were said to be of superior quality.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Where did that come from?

HON. MR. WARK.—It was not from the Island.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Where did it come from?

HON. MR. WARK.—I did not ask the captain.

HON. MR. HOWLAN.—You ought to know when you refer to it.

HON. MR. WARK—A request was made to take the head out of the barrel, and finer fish I never saw. The party was asked to take out some of the fish; he did so and still the fish were good. He was asked to take out some more, and then it was found that in the middle of the barrel the fish were of an inferior quality. But suppose the inspector could see every fish put in and then brand the barrel, the packer could take out the head of the barrel, remove some of the fish, and substitute inferior fish for them. I have heard of barrels being partly filled with seaweed after being inspected. It is not like inspecting butter; you can ascertain its quality at any time, but in buying fish you can depend upon nothing but the character of the man who packs them.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have no objection to postpone the reference of the Bill to a Committee of the Whole House until after the adjournment. It will give every hon. gentleman ample time to consider the measure carefully.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

The Senate adjourned at four p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, July 2nd 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

PONTIAC & PACIFIC JUNCTION RALWAY

MOTION.

HON. MR. TRUDEL moved:—

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General; praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a Return showing:

1. Who were the signers of the Petition for the incorporation of the Pontiac & Pacific Junction Railway Company;
2. The names of the original shareholders, with the amounts of their respective shares;
3. The amounts paid in by such shareholders, and the dates of such payments;
4. The names of the shareholders on the 1st of January, 1885;
5. The names of the present shareholders, with the amounts of their respective shares and the amounts paid up on each share.

He said:—The facts which gave rise to this motion are well known to the public. They have been discussed in the press, especially the press of the Province of

Quebec, and concern a company called the Pontiac & Pacific Junction Railway. This company was incorporated by an Act of this Parliament, and has received several grants of money from the Local Legislature of Quebec as well as from the Parliament of Canada. After those several grants of money had been made, five directors of the Company, out of seven I think, sold their shares for the sum of $90,000, and if the information which has been placed before the public is correct, three men have bought the amount of their shares—that is, two of the other directors and a third party—in order to control, or to be sole proprietors of the railway. These facts, which have been discussed in the press, have not been denied. I may say that a Minister of the Crown—a member of this Government—is the present proprietor of a certain number of shares in the railway. It was represented in the press that it was not desirable that the Ministers of the Crown should be interested in that way, and that while it is admitted that public money should be granted to encourage the construction of railways, those grants of money should not be of such an amount as to allow the shareholders, who may not have even put a cent into those undertakings, to realize large profits. In this case, the sale by five directors of their interest for the sum of $90,000 is evidence that there has been an excess in the granting of money to this railway, either from the Government of the Dominion or from the Government of the Province of Quebec. Those observations were answered through the press by the argument, that far from incurring any blame for being a shareholder in those railway companies, the member of the Government alluded to had thereby shown his zeal to promote the public interest, and that it was an act of patriotism. It seemed to me to be a rather strange doctrine, and I thought, as all the facts were not perfectly known, in this sense, that there was no official document before the country to show the proportion of shares held respectively by those who sold their interest in the railway, and who are the present purchasers of the whole stock of the company, and by whom the stock that was sold for $90,000 was purchased—that it was in the interest of the country to move the address of which I have given notice. I do not suppose that any other member of the Government is concerned in this matter, but as, in the opinion of some, it is an act of patriotism to speculate in railways subsidized by Parliament, I think it is in the interest of the country to know the precise facts. If the House orders the address, and the papers are brought down they may give rise to further proceedings in the matter.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The Government has no objection to the passage of the address which my hon. friend has moved, and on behalf of the member of the Government to whom he has made reference I beg to say he has assured me that he will see that the papers are laid on the table of the House with the utmost readiness.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (149), "An Act for granting to Her Majesty the sum of $1,700,000, required for defraying certain expenses in connection with the troubles in the North-West Territories." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

Bill (148,) "An Act to amend the Acts respecting the appointment of a Harbor Master at the port of Halifax." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

Bill (144), "An Act to authorize the augmentation of the North-West Mounted Police. (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

Bill (20), "An Act to modify the application of the Consolidation Insurance Act of 1877." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES BILL.

FIRST READING.

Bill (147), "An Act to Authorize the Grant of certain Subsidies in Land for the Construction of the Railways therein mentioned," was introduced and read the first time.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the Bill be read the second time on Monday next.

HON. MR. SCOTT—In connection with this, I should like my hon. friend to give us some information, on Monday next, about a company which I see is not named in this Bill, the North-Western Central, which was in the same position as the companies included in this Bill, that is, they had a charter to build a railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and an Order-in-Council was passed for a land grant similar to that given to the Manitoba and North-Western. I assumed, from a paragraph in the Governor General's Speech, that they all came in on the same principle, and would be entitled to their land grant as a matter of course, on the announcement of the Government's policy. I regret to find that this company is not mentioned in the list. I hope the leader of the Government will be prepared to tell us on Monday that it is not to be excluded from the advantages to be extended to the other companies. The point on the Canadian Pacific Railway from which the line was to run is Melbourne; 52 miles of the road has been graded, and a very considerable sum has been expended and the parties who had paid out this money naturally supposed, from the announcement made in the Governor's speech, that they would not be excluded from the operation of the Government's policy after Parliament had committed itself to the granting of a charter to build a road from a certain point, naming the point; and the Government having passed an Order-in-Council giving them a land grant at the rate of $1 per acre, and then having announced that the policy would be not to exact the price of the land, but to allow them to obtain the land on payment of the cost of survey, ten cents per acre.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I will make inquiries and answer my hon. friend's question on Monday. I naturally infer from the anxiety of my hon. friend to have another railway added to the list of those to be subsidized, that he now approves of the policy of aiding railways, to which he expressed himself as being so strongly opposed a few days ago.

HON. MR. SCOTT—My hon. friend does me an injustice. I have not expressed myself in opposition to granting this assistance to railways in the North-West Territories. On the contrary I complimented the Government, in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, on their announcement that they would give this assistance to railways for the development of that great country; and my remarks to-day in no way conflict with the line I adopted the other day, inasmuch as my argument then was that in the older parts of the country, members were practically—I will not say purchased, that might not be parliamentary.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think it would be parliamentary.

HON. MR. SCOTT—At all events it was a compromising position for the Government to assume, and they might have to subsidize railways through other localities which ought not to be assisted except by the local governments or the municipalities. But, so far as subsidizing railway enterprises in the North-West Territories I have always approved of that policy, and I congratulated the Government, on the announcement being made in the Speech from the Throne, on the stand they had taken, because I think the only way we can develop and hold the North-West Territory is to gridiron that country with railways. Had there been railways to Prince Albert and Battleford the late outbreak would in all probability not have occurred, or if it had occurred it would not have spread or been of such a serious character.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend must remember the melancholy tone in which he criticized the list of railways mentioned in the Subsidy Bill, and amongst them railways in the North-West Territories, and how he deplored the policy of the Government.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Those I read the other day were not in the North-West Territories.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Some of them were.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Not one of them.

The motion was agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT BILL

FIRST READING.

Bill (139) "An Act to amend the Act in relation to the Library of Parliament" was introduced from the House of Commons, and read the first time.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the Bill be read the second time to-morrow.

HON. MR. POWER—I hope the Minister of Justice will consent to postpone the second reading of this Bill until Tuesday.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Why?

HON. MR. POWER—It will be remembered by the House that when the adjournment, which has just closed, was proposed, the Minister of Justice said the public business would not suffer because there was no business before the House. Now, I take it, if important measures are hurried through without giving us an opportunity to discuss them, in a certain sense the public business does suffer, and I do not think it is too much to ask that a measure like this, as to which there is a good deal of difference of opinion, be allowed to stand over until Tuesday when there will be an opportunity to discuss it. That will not detain Parliament any.

HON. MR. PLUMB—That does not seem to me to be an adequate reason to postpone the Bill. On the same principle there could be no business done. We have met to do the business of the Senate; this is one of the bills which does not require any particular preparation or examination. We know that this bill has been before the other House for several weeks. Everybody understands its provision and everybody, by looking at the bill, without anything more than a cursory examination, will know what it means. I think it would be well that we should have some business before the House to-morrow, and of all the bills which are coming up, this is one for which there is the least reason to ask for a postponement.

HON. MR. POWER—I feel certain now that there must be something in the rumours we have heard that the hon. gentleman from Niagara was about becoming a member of the Ministry, as he has undertaken to-day to answer on behalf of the Government. It is an instance of coming events casting their shadows before. I simply made the request of the Government as a matter of courtesy, and although it might not be necessary for any hon. gentleman of the wonderful readiness and eloquence of my hon. friend from Niagara to prepare to discuss a question of this kind, still people who have not his capacity do require a little time to collect their thoughts, particularly when there are other subjects that they propose considering in the meantime.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Would it not answer if the hon. gentleman deferred his observations to another stage of the Bill?

HON. MR. POWER—I have no objection on that understanding.

The motion was agreed to.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AND LIQUOR LICENSE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

COMMONS AMENDMENTS.

A message was received from the House of Commons, returning Bill (92), "An Act further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, and the Liquor License Act, 1883," with the following message:

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Thursday, 18th June, 1885.

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honors that this House hath agreed to the first, second, fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth and ninth of their amendments to the Bill (No. 92) intituled: "An Act further to amend 'The Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' and 'The Liquor License Act, 1883,'" and have also agreed to their amendment, with the exception of the 5th paragraph of the 2nd proviso of the said third amendment, to which they have disagreed for the following reason:—"Because it contravenes the principle of the Act which provides that the sale of Alcohol and Spirits for the purposes mentioned

shall be made only on the certificate of two Justices of the Peace accompanied by the affirmation of the applicant and the registration of the sale, which are considered necessary safeguards against an abuse of the law."

And that they have added to the said third amendment, the following further proviso :—"Provided always that all such Physicians, Druggists and Chemists selling Alcohol or Spirituous Liquors shall keep a register of all such sales, indicating the name of the purchaser and the quantity sold, and shall make an annual return of all such sales on the 31st Decémber in each year to the Collector of Inland Revenue within whose Revenue Division such Physician, Druggist or Chemist resides."

"And that they have disagreed to the sixth amendment, for the following reasons :—"Because abuses have arisen in counties in which the Act has been adopted, owing to the absence of a penal Clause of this nature, and the provision is necessary in order to the proper and effective enforcement of the law."

And that they have amended the words so restored to the Bill, in page 2, line 15, by adding after the words "Medical man," the words "or other person authorized to grant certificates under this Act."

And that they have disagreed to the tenth amendment, for the following reason :—"Because forms are necessary for the efficient enforcement of the Act."

And that they have disagreed to the eleventh amendment, for the following reason :—"Because it is a violation of the fundamental principles of the Act, which, where adopted, prohibits the sale of all intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes; and because the Act has already been adopted in good faith by the Electors in 61 Counties and Cities of the Dominion, believing that under the express provisions of the law it would continue in force unimpaired for three years, and would then only be repealed by the same authority which adopted it; and the passing of the amendment would be a breach of faith on the part of parliament with the electors of these counties and cities; and further because the amendment is in direct opposition to the wishes of a large portion of the electors of the Dominion, as manifested by the petitions presented to Parliament."

And that they have disagreed to the twelfth amendmment, for the following reason :—"Because the House has reinstated the Clause providing Schedules."

Ordered, That the Clerk do carry the said message to the Senate.

Attest,

J. G. Bourinot,
Clerk of the Commons.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—The Bill was originally in charge of Mr. Vidal, who is not now in his place, and I have a letter in my hand from him, in which he asks me if the message should come up during his absence to have the consideration of it postponed until Monday next.

Hon. Mr. O'DONOHOE—I would ask the Minister of Justice to let it stand until Wednesday next. I think the changes are so considerable in the Bill that it should be granted : it would be impossible to consider the effect of the changes clearly without the Bill being reprinted with the amendments.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—The substance of the changes will appear in the minutes of the day, and we shall then see precisely what the suggestions are that come from the other House. I do not think there is any occasion to reprint the Bill.

Hon. Mr. O'DONOHOE—I was going to say that several members who take an active interest in the Bill will be absent until Wednesday, and their interest in the Bill might be equally well considered with that of the hon. gentleman who has charge of it.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have no doubt that the gentleman in charge of the Bill will postpone its consideration until Wednesday, if he is asked to do so, but I do not like to do it myself without his consent.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I think the Bill is in charge of the Minister of Justice, because when it was up for the third reading the hon. gentleman from Sarnia disclaimed any idea of passing the Bill in the shape it then presented, and the Minister of Justice took charge of it.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—It was, no doubt, an incident that occurred in the consideration of the Bill, but to show that the hon. member from Sarnia considers he is still in charge of the Bill, he has written me to ask that the consideration of the amendments be postponed until Monday.

The motion was agreed to.

THE GENERAL INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (135) "An Act to amend the General Inspection Act of 1874, and the Acts amending the same."

In the Committee,

On clause 3,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Difficulty has been found in getting people to act as deputy inspectors because under the law as it now stands they are not allowed to deal in the articles they inspect and that has been found very inconvenient, and it is thought no harm will happen if a party is interested because he will have to add the words, if he is deputy inspector, "and owner." It also shows how the inspection is done and by whom. There is a provision that every deputy inspector who violates the Act shall be liable to a penalty.

HON. MR. POWER—I am very glad the Government have made this amendment. The law, as it stands, has been found to work very unsatisfactorily. It has caused a great deal of inconvenience to deputy inspectors and people who would be inspectors, and it has not done any good to the public. I think that this change is a very great improvement.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am very glad to hear my hon. friend say so. I am sure if he will watch the Government measures carefully he will find a great many of them of the same character.

The clause was adopted.

On the 6th clause,

HON. MR. HOWLAN—This is an important clause. Under the existing Act the chief inspector must give security, and all his assistants must furnish security to him. I do not think the security should be done away with.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We are now going to appoint people who are dealing in the article and who will not devote all their time to the work.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—But a man, besides inspecting for himself, will inspect for others in his neighborhood.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Why should he give security?

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Because the chief inspector is liable for his acts.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not altogether agree with my hon. friend from Alberton, although I am aware he knows a great deal about the business. I do not know how it has been in other provinces, but in Nova Scotia it has been found very difficult to secure deputy inspectors because of the difficulty they experience in getting bondsmen. If my hon. friend from Alberton will look at section 3 he will find that it contains a provision which subjects the deputy inspector to a penalty of $100 and forfeiture of his office if he violates any of the provisions of the Act, and the chief inspector being responsible for his deputies he will be careful to appoint reliable men. I think there is ample security for the public. A very serious practical difficulty has been found in the working of the law as it now stands, and this change is an improvement. I think it was recommended by the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. POWER—That Chamber is largely made up of men engaged in the trade.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think my hon. friend from Halifax is right as to the difficulty in getting efficient officers to perform the duty. I consider this an improvement on the Act. It will secure the chief inspector from any loss that may be incurred through any fault on the part of his deputy.

The clause was adopted.

On the 8th clause,

Hon. Mr. POWER—I would like to ask the Minister if he can inform the committee whether this portion of the Bill has been approved of by the Chamber of Commerce at Halifax? I think the Commissioner of Inland Revenue sent a copy of the Bill to the Chamber of Commerce and it was nearly all approved of. The reason I ask the question is that serious difficulties have arisen in matters dealt with in this clause. Where a deputy inspector in one county has inspected fish and those fish have gone to Halifax, and a dispute has arisen between the purchaser of the fish and the inspector as to whether they were properly inspected or not, there was no authority under the existing law to settle the difficulty. Now I see that sub-section 4 says:—

"If any dispute arises between the inspector or deputy inspector for any of the places hereinbefore mentioned by name, where there is a board of trade or chamber of commerce, and the owner or possessor of any article inspected under this Act, with regard to the quality or condition of such article, or relating thereto, such dispute shall not be decided in the manner in this section before provided, but upon application by either of the parties to the dispute, to the secretary of the board of trade, or the chamber of commerce for the place where the dispute has arisen."

Now, the difficulty does not arise so often in the county of Halifax, where there is a Chamber of Commerce, as it does with regard to fish that come from outlying counties. I know the desire of the chamber was that there should be some tribunal, which should deal with those disputes. Under the existing law there does not seem to be any one with power to deal with them. I do not understand that sub-clause 4 creates any tribunal to deal with such cases. Sub-clause 3 says that if any dispute arises between any inspector and deputy inspector, and the owner or possessor of any article inspected by him, in respect of which a chief inspector has been appointed, that it can only be referred to the chief inspector when the parties agree to make the reference. The case where the parties do not agree does not seem to be provided for. Will the Minister be kind enough to ascertain whether this clause as it stands met with the approval of the Chamber of Commerce?

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—I will ascertain if it has. I understood generally the Bill met with their approval.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN—As I understand, where there is no Chamber of Commerce a tribunal of three, one to be chosen by the inspector, one by the owner of the article, and one by the neighbouring magistrate—three persons of skill—settle the matter.

Hon. Mr. POWER—That applies where there is a dispute between the inspector and the owner. For instance if fish were inspected in the county of Guysborough, this first sub-clause would provide for settling it, but suppose the fish are shipped from Guysborough to Halifax and a difficulty occurs, then this sub-clause does not provide for settling such a difficulty.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN—the case which my hon. friend puts is this: say the fish are inspected in Guysborough and sold in Halifax and a dispute arises as to whether the fish have been properly inspected or not—this Act provides, in such a case, that the matter shall be referred to the Chamber of Commerce or board of trade.

Hon. Mr. POWER—No.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN—Yes, if any dispute arises between the inspector or deputy inspector where there is a Chamber of Commerce, that is the mode of settlement.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I do not think I have made myself clear. Suppose the fish are inspected by a deputy inspector in Guysborough county and they come to Halifax and the purchaser finds the fish not up to the brand; under this provision the question should be settled by three persons to be named by the justice of the peace in Guysborough.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN—The practical working of that would he this; suppose 100 barrels of No. 1 mackerel had been inspected in the town of Guysborough and

sold in Halifax. The purchaser says the goods are not of the quality they ought to be according to the brand. To whom is he to appeal? This Bill says the Chamber of Commerce.

HON. MR. POWER—No. That is where a dispute occurs between a purchaser and the inspector or deputy inspector in any place where there is a board of trade. In the case which we have been assumiug the dispute is with the inspector at Guysborough, where there is no Chamber of Commerce.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Then he would have to summon the deputy inspector. Suppose those mackerel, which were branded No. 1 turned out to be No. 2, the deputy, or chief, as the case might be, would be responsible, and the difficulty would have to be settled by the chamber of commerce.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The dispute might be inchoate until the fish got to Halifax; then it does not seem very clear whether, if the dispute arose partly in Guysborough and partly in Halifax, it is to be decided in Halifax, where there is a Chamber of Commerce, or in Guysborough, where there is none; but the dispute would not arise in Guysborough. It would arise in Halifax when the fish came to be sold and turned over to a new purchaser—the dispute would arise as to whether they were up to the brand or not. The dispute would be settled in the way laid down here for a place where there is a Chamber of Commerce.

HON. MR. POWER—It is only if the dispute arises between the inspector and the owner, but here the dispute would arise between the deputy inspector at Guysborough and the purchaser at Halifax. I merely wish the Minister of Justice to ascertain if this clause has been approved of by the Chamber of Commerce.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—This is quite clear. It states that if any dispute arises in the places named—there can be no dispute between the inspector and the deputy inspector only when fault is found by a third party. No dispute can arise between the chief inspector and the deputy. The dispute is to be settled by either of the parties to the dispute appealing to the Chamber of Commerce where the dispute has arisen.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think it is clear, because it says this dispute, which is to be settled by the Chamber of Commerce, must be a dispute arising between an inspector, at a place where there is a Chamber of Commerce, and the owner. It is limited to that. It must be a dispute between the owner and an inspector at a place where there is a board of trade. Now, as in Guysborough there is no board of trade, this clause does not provide for a dispute between the inspector at Guysborough and the purchaser or owner. It wants to be cleared up, I think.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Section 11 provides for a dispute where there is no Chamber of Commerce.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, but this sub-section 4 only hits the case of a dispute in a locality where there is a board of trade. It does not hit a dispute between the inspector at a place where there is no board of trade, and the owner.

The clause was adopted.

On the 9th clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This clause will do away with compulsory inspection.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I think that is a very important matter; it is the most important clause in the Bill, and I am only surprised that any inspection bill, having such a clause as that in it, should be placed before Parliament. The only way that I can account for it, is, that the bill emanates from a department that does not know anything about fish. It is a bill which should have emanated from the Fisheries Department. We have several Inspection Acts scattered through the Statutes, starting from the first bill introduced, I think, by the Marine and Fisheries Department, and which was a very

good Act. It was an Act compiled from the American Acts, from the French Acts and from the English Acts, and worked very well indeed—so much so, that our fish soon attained a reputation which, up to that time, they did not have. I think it is unfortunate that any department should interfere with what might be called the jurisdiction of trade. A few years ago we had a bill placed before us with regard to the regulation of scales, which, if passed into law, would have been found to be so impracticable that it would have had to be abandoned. Here is a bill asking us to do away with the bulwarks we have had placed around our fishing industry for the last forty years. If the Chambers of Commerce are to be consulted with regard to petty disputes between inspectors and sub-inspectors, how much more should they be requested to give their opinion with regard to the practical working of a bill like this. The Board of Trade of Halifax has more to do with the fisheries of this Dominion than any other board of trade in Canada, and that Board of Trade is opposed to the abolition of compulsory inspection.

HON. MR. POWER—They are opposed to this particular clause.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I am not surprised at it If we look at the statistics of the exports of fish from Canada, we will find that very nearly one-half of the whole quantity is from Nova Scotia. The total value of the Fisheries of Canada, for 1884, is reckoned as follows :—

Nova Scotia	$ 8,763,779.36
New Brunswick	3,730,453.99
Quebec	1,694,560.85
British Columbia	1,358,267,10
Ontario	1,133,724.26
Prince Edward Island	1,085,618,68
Showing a total of	$17,766,404.24

Now the Board of Trade of Halifax, from which port the great bulk of the exports of the fish of Nova Scotia takes place, have condemned this Bill, and very properly so. No practical man would break down the law we now have. Within the last few days we have had before us a bill for the inspection of manure, and if Parliament think it is necessary that there should be a close inspection of fertilizers, how much more important it is that we should have compulsory inspection of one of the most important items of food that the Dominion produces. I have not seen in any newspaper, nor have I heard from any practical man engaged in the fisheries, that there is anything to justify the abolition of the protection that our fish industries have enjoyed hitherto under compulsory inspection. The Halifax Chamber of Commerce, when this bill was submitted to them, passed a resolution on the 13th of May, approving of the Bill now before Parliament respecting the Inspection of Fish, with the exception of the omission of the clause making inspection compulsory, a system which the Chamber unanimously favored.

Now, if that is a fact—and I have taken it from the Halifax *Herald* of the 14th May—I do not see any reason why we should throw aside the advice which is offered by those men who are engaged in the fisheries, and whose business it is. I may say that I have had some little experience of the fisheries myself, and that it is a business that requires all the assistance that it can have without being hampered in any way ; and if the reputation of our fish is to be destroyed by a bill of this kind, I think we ought to pause before allowing it to become law. We have, in the maritime portion of the Dominion, some of the most important food fish of the world, and, within my recollection, from being almost an unsaleable article in the markets of the world, they have gained a good reputation. That reputation has only been obtained by strict attention to packing, and close inspection. The fact that our herrings are of so little value as compared with what they might be, is from the lack of more rigid inspection than they receive. Many hon. gentlemen are no doubt aware that the Loch Fyne or Scotch herring are looked upon as the best herring in the world. Such, however, is not the case. They are not as good herring as we have in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, but they are treated in a different way. Some years ago the government of New Brunswick thought that they should get a complete inspection of fish by a man of practical knowledge, Mr. H. M. Perley, whose report I now hold in my hand, and it is

the best report extant of the fisheries of the Dominion, even to this day. With regard to the item of herring, after speaking of spring herring, which are taken in set nets along the eastern shore of New Brunswick, which, being caught while in the act of spawning, are thin and poor, he says :

"Another herring appears on the coast about the 20th August and remains in-shore for a month ; these are fat and in good condition, furnishing excellent food, and a valuable commodity for export. It is admitted that when first caught these fall herrings are fully equal in every respect to the best Scotch herrings, and if they were cured in the Dutch manner, this fishery, from the increased price and demand, would become one of the most important and valuable fisheries of the Gulf."

At the date of this report (1852) there was very little attention paid to this matter ; but everyone knows that since then the herrings of Nova Scotia are not only equal to but superior to the best Labrador herring, and they have been made so by strict inspection. If we abolish this protection and make it no longer compulsory to inspect fish, we will do away with the whole benefit of the laws under which our fish trade has been built up during the past quarter of a century. If I were to read the hon. gentleman a description of the amount of labor that is bestowed on the curing and packing of Scotch herring as compared with ours, they would be surprised. It is this that makes Scotch herrings worth from three to four pounds a barrel in the German markets, and so careful are the packers that the bung of the barrel which contains the pickled fish is made of hard wood, sealed with a seal and registered. The Dutch mode of curing herrings is thus described by Mr. Chambers in his "Tour in Holland in 1838."

"Immediately on being caught the herrings are bled, gutted, cleaned, salted and barrelled. The bleeding is effected by cutting them across the back of the neck and then hanging them up for a few seconds by the tail. By being thus relieved of the blood the fish retain a certain sweetness of flavor and delicacy of flesh which unbled herrings cannot possibly possess. The rapidity of the process of curing must likewise aid in preserving the native delicacy of the animal, for the herring lies salted in the barrel in a very few minutes after it has been swimming in the water. I was assured that the superiority of the Dutch herrings is solely ascribable to this mode of curing."

That is not done with our fish. If it were rendered necessary, as it is under the inspection laws of England, we would never hear of Loch Fyne herring being so much better than our own. It is not, in fact, any better than our own, it is only want of care and diligence in curing and packing that renders ours less valuable. I will give you a little of my own experience. In 1866, at the City of Boston, I had a vessel with a cargo of mackerel. On the other side of the wharf where she lay there was a vessel from Nova Scotia, also with a cargo of fish. The Nova Scotia fish was inspected, and was sold readily ; mine was not inspected, and I was subjected to a loss of $1.50 per barrel, for want of an inspection law in my Province. When I got back to Prince Edward Island I introduced a Bill in the Legislature there for the inspection of fish, which is in operation to this day, and which has been a great benefit to the trade of that Province. From my own experience I say that the best opinion you could have is the opinion of the Chamber of Commerce and the Board of Trade at Halifax, who are interested in this matter, and if they unanimously favor the compulsory inspection of fish I think we ought to hesitate before we throw down the barrier in the way that this Bill proposes to do.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am very glad that my hon. friend from Alberton has taken up this question—the compulsory inspection of fish, as he is a practical man, and is thoroughly familiar with the subject. He has referred to the fact that Nova Scotia exports nearly half of all the fish exported from the Dominion, and I might inform my hon. friend that the County of Lunenburg, from which I come, ships one-half of the fish exported from Nova Scotia, or one-fourth of the whole of the fish exported from the Dominion. Having had to do largely with fishermen and ship owners, I, myself, found that for some time a strong feeling existed against compulsory inspection in Halifax. That feeling was caused by fish sent in from outports being improperly inspected and the brand could not be relied upon. The law under which such fish can be re-inspected in Halifax will obviate that

difficulty. I know from persons who are engaged in the trade that in the United States the inspection of our fish is of great value, and the inspection of fish in the county from which I come has always been taken as reliable. With regard to the West India trade, the inspection is of little value, owing to the distance and to climatic influences. I think that under compulsory inspection our fish will be put up in a manner that will command the highest markets in the United States.

HON. MR. SMITH—When and where would you have this compulsory inspection?

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Wherever the fish are taken.

HON. MR. SMITH—The reason I put that question is this: I contend that if you want the inspection, that inspection should be made at the place the fish are first packed.

HON. MR. POWER—That is where it is generally done.

HON. MR. SMITH—No, lately that has not been the case. I say that if you inspect there, it is all right and proper, but if you send those fish to Quebec or Montreal, or to any other market, and then inspect them, it destroys the whole value of inspection, and I would prefer to have no inspection whatever.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Why?

HON. MR. SMITH—Because the inspector opens the barrels, say at Montreal. Those barrels are very slim, and they can never be re-headed in such a way as to retain the pickle, and the fish that are opened for inspection there can never be repacked so as to make the barrels hold the pickle, and if the fish are fat they become rusty in a short time.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—What kind of fish do you speak of?

HON. MR. SMITH—I speak principally of herring—Labrador and North shore, such as used to come to our market. I say that the inspection at the place the fish are packed would be perfectly right and proper; but the inspection in any other place destroys the fish, and has a tendency to make them rust and decay when stored in cellars.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Fish are always inspected at the place they are packed.

HON. MR. SMITH—Not always, because in Montreal they have been opened and inspected, and it has been the cause of destroying the fish so that they could not be sold for one-fourth of what they would have brought as originally packed. In former years we bought on the reputation of the packer. For instance there was Rourke's brand. He was a first-class packer, and his brand could be relied on.

HON. MR. DEVER—Where did he pack?

HON. MR. SMITH—In Newfoundland.

HON. MR. DEVER—On board schooners?

HON. MR. SMITH—No.

HON. MR. DEVER—How are you going to inspect fish when packed on board schooners as they are caught?

HON. MR. SMITH—Those are fish that we packed on shore. They were caught by small vessels and brought ashore to be packed, and they were sold on the reputation of the packer. Rourke's brand was known in every market, and his herring were worth $1 per barrel more than any other. I say that the place to inspect fish is where the fish are packed. Other fish might be worth $5 a barrel when originally packed and they would not fetch $3 in the market after they were warranted.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—My hon. friend must refer to Newfoundland fish.

HON. MR. SMITH—No I do not. There are fish improperly packed on our own shores as well as in Newfoundland, but not by men whose character is at

stake. If you make inspection compulsory at the place the fish are packed it will be all right; but if you do not it will be better to have no inspection, and let every packer sell on his own brand and reputation.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I wish to show to the hon. gentleman what the fish exported by the Dominion consists of:—

The following table shews the value of the several kinds of fish taken in Canada in 1884.

Cod	$4,302,454.85
Herring	2,645,447.00
Lobsters	2,351,559.80
Mackerel	1,826,681.03
Salmon	1,357,727.64
Haddock	758,245.70
Fish oils	477,443.40
Trout	464,653.00
Sardines	384,600.00
Smelt	370,644.60
Pollock	275,222.50
Whitefish	271,971.28
Hake	217,981.70
Alewives	189,854.50
Seal Skins	166,788.00
Oysters	126,458.00
Pickerel	111,452.06
Halibut	98,532.90
Sturgeon	88,899.60
Eels	84,714.80
Bass	75,573.30
Shad	74,058.41

My hon. friend says he would like to see the fish inspected where they are caught. I would like to know where else they would be inspected? I remember a few years ago a gentleman visited the Magdalen Islands, and wrote an article on the fisheries there. In the course of his inquiries some wag told him that in the spring at times herrings were so plentiful that when the high tide was in all the fishermen had to do was to hold the barrels in the water and the herrings ran in. This was gravely stated by the writer as a fact, and it can be found in the library here by anyone who has the curiosity to see it. Newfoundland has no inspection law for their barrels. We have an inspection law which provides that a barrel shall be so many inches long in the stave and a certain diameter. In Nova Scotia, where they are very strict, they provide that the bung of the barrel shall consist of hard wood. The hon. gentleman from Toronto tells us that it is impossible to re head barrels so that they will retain pickle. I can tell him the reason why they cannot get the heads back in the barrel; in a great many cases the heads were not made to fit the barrels. They were gathered up indiscriminately and put in indiscriminately; but in some places the barrels are branded at the cooper's and sent down to the packer. We have a character, a reputation, for our fish. We have made that reputation and that character by our strict inspection laws. Once it goes abroad that it is optional with our packers to inspect their fish, that moment the reputation of our fish falls. There is no doubt about that, and the markets in which our fish are sold will very soon come to the conclusion that the reputation of our fish is gone. I have heard it stated that fish cannot be pickled or cured without sea water. That idea has long since been exploded. If my hon. friend goes to New York or to Boston he will find fresh water used in making the pickle for packing fish. It has to be made in a particular way; but there is no more difficulty in curing fish with pickle made with fresh water than there is with pickle made with sea water, if it is well made. If you take any quantity of pickled fish, no matter how good the barrels are, and put them into a cellar and leave them there without looking after them from time to time, they are sure to spoil if the pickle goes off. That is one more reason why we should have compulsory inspection. The finer the fish the sooner they will spoil if the pickle is lost.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It might be well to read to the House the view which is taken on this point by the Department of Inland Revenue, the Deputy Minister, Mr. Miall, says in the memorandum that he has given to me:—

Under the Act as it now stands, the inspection of fish and hides is compulsory in districts in which inspectors have been appointed. In respect of all other articles, flour, grain, beef, pork, butter, pot and pearl ashes, the inspection is optional.

While the department has had no evidence whatever brought before it from 1874 to the present time, indicating that the law, in respect of those articles whose inspection is not compulsory, has failed fully to meet the

requirements of trade, there has been a never-ceasing correspondence in respect of the articles of fish and hides, and although amendments have been made, year after year in reference to the views of those most interested, the Act still does not give public satisfaction.

While it is believed that a proper inspection is very desirable, and, while I am free to admit that the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax has expressed its views in favor of continuation of compulsory inspection, it is impossible not to see in the correspondence before the department a very strong argument in favor of providing the machinery for inspection, but leaving individual traders free to avail themselves of it or not, as their interests may dictate.

For many years great stress was laid on the inspection of deals in Quebec, and deals are still inspected there, but I know that the opinion of many persons who have a real knowledge of the trade in deals, and are themselves in that business, is against compulsory inspection. My hon. friend from Alberton says that the fish will deteriorate in quality if compulsory inspection is abolished; but that has not been the experience of the country in reference to other articles. The only two articles as to which inspection is compulsory are fish and hides. Then there are a great many other articles of which inspection sometimes takes place, but is not compulsory—for instance flour (that used to be compulsory), grain, beef, pork, butter, and pot and pearl ashes. I do not know about grain, but certainly in beef and pork, and butter and potash, there used to be compulsory inspection, but that has been done away with, and I do not think that any deterioration has taken place in any of these articles. For instance there has been an improvement in butter, which occupies a very much higher position than it used to do in olden times.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN—No.

Hon. Mr. SMITH—It does in Ontario.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—I believe that butter has improved without compulsory inspection. I have read articles saying that the butter produced in Ontario has improved very much, particularly in Perth, and that both butter and cheese are much better in quality throughout the province than they were some years ago.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B. C.)—I wish they would send some of that good butter down to Ottawa during the session.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—The argument is that the quality of fish will deteriorate if we do not make inspection compulsory. In reply to that, I say, with reference to those articles I have mentioned—

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN—We have had for a long number of years compulsory inspection and our fish have a character and reputation for that reason. If we drop compulsory inspection now we will lose that reputation.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—I was quoting my hon. friend's views correctly. He thinks if we do not continue to make the inspection compulsory the character of our fish will deteriorate. In reply to that I have shown that other articles which are not inspected now, but which were inspected in former years, have not deteriorated. Will any one say that pork has not improved in quality since the inspection of it ceased to be compulsory? According to this memorandum, the only two articles in which inspection continues to be compulsory are those I have mentioned, fish and hides. I think in all the other articles where inspection has ceased to be compulsory we have gained ground instead of losing it, and therefore there is no reason to suppose that we will lose ground if we cease to make the inspection of fish compulsory. People will take pride in their own brands. Of course it is not a matter in which I have knowledge, but the strong opinion of the Department is that it would be desirable no longer to make the inspection of fish compulsory.

Hon. Mr. SMITH—The hon. gentleman from Alberton spoke of fish being re-packed in Boston in fresh water. I would ask the hon. gentleman are the fish thus re-packed with fresh water as good as if they were packed with sea water, provided they can get it clear?

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN—Yes, quite as good.

HON. MR. SMITH—I contend they are not. I contend there is nothing as good as pure salt water to pack herrings in; but the reason they do not re-pack them in salt water at Boston is that they cannot get pure sea water there. It is quite easy to see that that is why they use fresh water.

HON. MR. HOWLAN — Boston is situated on tidal water, and there is no difficulty in securing clean salt water there. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice stated that the Deputy Minister of the Department of Inland Revenue has had no correspondence calling for this repeal of the compulsory sections of the Act.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No; what he says is, that he has had no correspondence indicating any dissatisfaction with the Act as regards those goods where the inspection is not compulsory, but he has had a great deal of correspondence with reference to hides and fish where the inspection is compulsory, and the whole volume of correspondence leads him to suppose that it would be better not to have the inspection of fish compulsory.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I will give my hon. friend an authority quite as good as the Deputy Minister who, I presume, does not know anything practically about the question. I will quote from the report of M. H. Perley on the progress of the Fisheries of New Brunswick :—

"The great step towards increasing the fisheries and rendering them more valuable, is the enactment of a general inspection law, with provisions for the appointment in every county and district of competent and trustworthy inspectors of dried, pickled, and smoked fish; and a total prohibition of the sale or exportation of any such fish, unless inspected and branded by the proper officer."

Now, you can take that opinion as against Mr. Miall's.

HON. MR. POWER—The Minister of Justice will notice that the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue is simply giving an opinion that he has formed him elf. It does not appear that he is expressing the opinions of persons who are engaged in the business, and who would naturally know more about the subject than the Deputy Minister.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is not his own opinion he is giving, but he says he has come to that conclusion from the correspondence received in the Department.

HON. MR. POWER—Why does he say that? The Deputy Minister says that as to these articles the inspection of which is not compulsory, he has had very little correspondence. That is what one would expect—where there is no compulsory inspection no disputes arise, but where inspection is compulsory, questions arise between the inspectors and owners, and that leads to correspondence with the Department as to what the meaning of the law is, and suggesting that the law should be altered a little here and there.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend misquotes what I read. I will read it as it is here. "While the Department has no evidence whatever brought before it from 1874 to the present time indicating that the law in respect of those articles whose inspection is not compulsory has failed fully to meet the requirements of trade, there has been a never ceasing correspondence in respect of the articles of fish and hides, and although amendments have been made year after year in deference to the views of those most interested, the Act still does not give public satisfaction."

HON. MR. POWER—But the Department have been bothered with compulsory inspection because that is really all that the Department has anything to do with. But there is another way, and a much more important way of considering the subject, and that is as to the sale of those goods in the markets of the world. Our fish is nearly all exported; the great market for pickled fish, for mackerel particularly, is the city of Boston—that is the market where nearly all of them go to. The hon. gentleman from Alberton gave an instance in his own experience which shows the value of a good inspection law. He says there were two vessels lying at the same wharf, one from Nova Scotia where they have had an inspection law for forty or fifty years, and another from his own province where they had no inspection law, and the fish from Nova Scotia brought

$1.50 a barrel more than the fish which were not inspected, although they were equally good. The treaty under which our fish were admitted into the United States duty free has expired; some of the fishermen have to contend now in the markets of the United States with a duty of $2 a barrel. If in addition to that, by repealing this inspection law, which has undoubtedly given our fish a character and reputation in the American market, you lower and degrade the character of our fish, you are going to place our fishermen in an exceedingly difficult position.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, if it does degrade it.

HON. MR. POWER—That would be the tendency. The Nova Scotia inspection has been thought well of in the United States, and if the inspection law is repealed, and fish are sent there uninspected, the effect of that, taken together with the imposing of the duty on fish, will be serious indeed. The very thing will happen of which the hon. gentleman from Toronto has spoken, because when our fish go to Boston, Gloucester, New York and other American cities uninspected, inspection there will be considered necessary. The Massachusetts laws, and the laws of other states require inspection. Those fish will have to be inspected there, and then the consequences, of which a member of the Government has spoken, will to a certain extent follow. It always injures fish to take them out and repack them, particularly in warm weather, as very often would happen if they were reinspected in the United States. I think that is a very serious consideration. One can gather from the memorandum of the deputy Minister that he does not lay any very special stress on this provision of the law, and I hope I am not guilty of saying anything unparliamentary when I state that in the course of a private conversation with the deputy Minister he said he did not lay any stress on this particular provision. When I suggested, as all the rest of the Bill had the approval of the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax, that it might be as well to let the Bill go, as they had approved of it, omitting this particular provision, and if a law with the amendments which this Bill makes in it after the experience of a year or two is found to work unsatisfactorily, this change might then be made, on the whole the Deputy Minister did not seem to see any serious objection to that. When we consider that in those Maritime Provinces where they have had a great deal of experience in the fish business, compulsory inspection has been in force in all of them for a number of years, it is a very strong argument in favor of our retaining it. We have the unanimous expression of opinion from the Chamber of Commerce at Halifax in favor of retaining compulsory inspection. I hope that, under the circumstances, the Minister will consent to omit this provision for the present at any rate. It may be limited to fish alone: as to hides I do not feel that it is a matter of much consequence. The Minister has referred to butter and some other articles. I should be quite satisfied to rest my case on that. The reputation of Canadian butter in the markets of the world—certainly the reputation of butter from some of the provinces—is, to say the least of it, indifferent. It is much easier to ascertain the quality of a tub of butter than the quality of a barrel of fish. The man who wishes to examine butter runs an instrument called a tryer to the bottom of the tub and gets a sample of the whole tub. That cannot be done with fish. The packages have to be emptied to ascertain what they contain, and it involves great delay and expense. As this change in the law has not been asked for by the people who are interested in the matter, and as the Department is not strong on the point and as the people who are most interested ask that the change be not made, I hope that the Minister will consent to let this clause stand over, and if it is found that the Act, with the amendments made by this Bill, works satisfactorily compulsory inspection need not be abandoned, but if it does not work satisfactorily, then the change can be made later on.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I hope the Minister will pay some regard to the remarks of the hon. member from Halifax. If you relax the law once you will find it hard to get back to the position we occupy now. I have had a conversation

with the Deputy Minister, and I found that he had no opinion at all on the matter. He did not know what to say about this compulsory inspection. He was in such doubt about it that he did not know what should be done. I believe, in the lower ports now the opinion is in favor of compulsory inspection. In Halifax, in consequence of not trusting to country inspection, there was a feeling against it because they had to re-inspect there, but I think the feeling now is in favor of compulsory inspection.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Perhaps the better way would be for me to ask the committee to pass over that clause for the present, and I will have further conversation with the officers of the department, and when we are in committee again I will bring down any evidence there may be in the department which has induced the officers to believe that the change would be a good one. In the meantime we will pass it over.

The clause was allowed to stand.

On the 11th clause,

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Is it considered essential that extra Manitoba hard wheat should consist of one kind only—red Fife wheat? It seems strange that if there is any other wheat of equal quality it should not have the same rank, because it does not happen to be red Fife wheat. I should think the more varieties of wheat you can get to come up to the highest standard the better.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The next paragraph requires only 85 per cent. of red Fife wheat.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—It seems to me that the best quality of spring wheat is confined, in this Bill, to red Fife. I do not think that it is judicious, or in the interests of the farmers and of all other classes, that other varieties should not be recognized if they are equally good.

HON SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The wheat spoken of in this clause is a variety which, when carefully cultivated, yields a remarkably fine quality of grain, and it is proposed that where a man grows that kind of wheat and wants it branded, he shall have it marked "extra Manitoba hard wheat."

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—The hon. gentleman fails to perceive the point I make. Another man may grow another kind of wheat, not red Fife, which may weigh 63 pounds to the bushel, but under this clause he could not get it graded "extra Manitoba hard wheat."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I suppose there is no objection to branding red Fife wheat as provided for in this clause, if it weighs 62 pounds to the bushel. If there is some other kind which will weigh as much or more, we could include it also.

HON. MR. DICKEY—The objection of the hon, member from Prince Edward Island is that it could not be admitted under this section. Only red Fife can be admitted under this clause as "extra Manitoba hard wheat." If another kind is equally good there is no reason why it should not be admitted under that brand. My hon. friend's suggestion is, I suppose, that the words "red Fife" should be struck out, leaving it any kind of sound, well cleaned wheat which weighs 62 pounds to the bushel.

HON. MR. GIRARD—The red Fife is a variety of spring wheat which has been introduced in the Northwest and has succeeded there remarkably well; and it would be well if it were spread over the whole Dominion. It would render an immense service to the country. In the other varieties of Manitoba hard wheat there is red Fife also, but not being altogether red Fife it cannot be classed as "extra Manitoba hard wheat." Wheat composed exclusively of red Fife is what the farmers in the Northwest wish to have branded as "extra Manitoba hard wheat."

The clause was adopted.

On the 16th clause,

HON. MR. POWER—I should like to have that clause stand until the Bill is in Committee again. It increases the cost of inspection from five to seven cents a

barrel. The Minister might inquire as to the reasons for making the change. I know the increase will be very objectionable to the fishermen and others engaged in the fish trade in the Maritime Provinces.

The clause was allowed to stand.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE, from the Committee, reported that they had made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

The Senate adjourned at 5:30 p. m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Friday, July 3rd, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock p. m.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

HARBOR MASTER AT HALIFAX BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (148), "An Act to amend the Act respecting the appointment of a harbor master at the port of Halifax." He said: This Bill, in the 1st clause, is to afford facilities for recovering penalties for breach of regulations; the second clause is for the purpose of increasing the remuneration of the harbor master of the port of Halifax by $200.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not rise for the purpose of opposing the Bill, but for the purpose of asking the Minister how the harbor master of St. John is paid, whether he is paid a fixed sum or is allowed to take all the fees?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think he takes the fees in the same way as the harbor master at Halifax.

HON. MR. POWER—When the Bill goes into committee I hope the Minister will be prepared to state positively.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Is there anything that a harbor master undertakes to do by this Bill he has not previously done?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, but the number of vessels coming to the port has increased—the number of coasting vessels—and it was thought desirable to add to the income of the harbor master in this way.

THE SPEAKER—And he pays his office rent out of it.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (139), "An Act to amend the Act in relation to the Library of Parliament." He said: This is a Bill for the purpose of appointing two Librarians instead of one and arranging for a staff under these officers for the management of the Library; the salaries to be given to the chief officers is not to exceed $3,000, chief messenger not to exceed $700, and the other officers on the scale of the civil servants, and there is a provision in the end that nothing in this Act contained shall operate to diminish the salary of any officer or servant now employed in the library. I know that the fact of having a Joint Librarian has excited some remarks, but it is often an advantage that there should be a French Librarian, as well as an English Librarian, for the convenience of persons who desire to consult those officers.

HON. MR. POWER—I cannot allow the second reading of this Bill to pass without saying a few words against it. There are two objections to the measure; one on the ground of the additional expense, and the other on the ground of policy. Now as to the first objection, I think it is clear that this Bill involves considerable additional expense. In the first place, you have the salaries of two Librarians to provide instead of the salary of one Librarian.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—But there is no assistant Librarian.

HON. MR. POWER—On referring to the existing statute governing the Library, I find that the salary of the Librarian as set down there is $2,500; the salary to the assistant librarian is $1,800. It is true the late Librarian, Mr. Todd, was allowed a larger salary than the salary set down here, in consideration of his long services and great ability; but if we were appointing a Librarian to take Mr. Todd's place, I do not think that that librarian would necessarily begin on the salary which Mr. Todd had at the time of his death, and the salaries ought to be governed by the original statute. The 4th section of the Act of 1871 gives a list of the officers of the Library. It says the officers and servants of the Library of Parliament shall consist of a Librarian, assistant librarian, two clerks and two messengers. This Bill provides for two Librarians, two first-class clerks, two second-class clerks, and three third class clerks; that is, instead of having a librarian and an assistant librarian you will have two librarians, and instead of three clerks you will have seven clerks, and instead of two messengers you will have four; so that the staff will be considerably increased. I know that the staff has been increased since the passage of the Act of 1871, but this will increase it still further. The tendency will be to further increase the expense in the future —unnecessary expense. Under the present system clerks have been appointed when they have been found, in the actual working of the Library, to be absolutely necessary. Under the system which will be initiated by this Bill clerks will be appointed in a different way. It will be found for instance that it is necessary to have an additional English clerk, and immediately as a matter of course an additional French clerk will be appointed; or if it happens the other way that an additional French clerk is needed, under the arrangement provided by this Bill an additional English clerk who may not be necessary at all will be appointed. That is the way this double-headed system works always and we have no reason to suppose that the library of Parliament will be an exception. Those are the principal grounds of objection to this measure, as to the additional expense. Then there is an objection to the policy. A double-headed department means, as a matter of course, unnecessary expense, and it means unsatisfactory working. The proverb that a house divided against itself cannot stand, we find exemplified continually. There are to be two heads to this Library and the result of that will be that there will be no head—no one person who can be referred to in case of a difference of opinion between the joint officers. This experiment has been tried in other cases. It was tried, I think, in the Parliamentary Library in Quebec and was found not to answer satisfactorily; and it has been tried in other departments, and I see no hope that the system will work better in connection with the Library than it has in other cases. I think that the history of this matter of the Librarianship reflects very little credit upon the Government. When the late Mr. Todd died, it was the duty of the Government, particularly as that gentleman's death took place during the sitting of Parliament, to have appointed a successor immediately, or after a decent interval, and it was their duty then to have selected one competent man to take Mr. Todd's place. But they did not do that. The Government might have appointed Mr. Decelles, who had acted as assistant Librarian, ; if they had done that I think no o ne could have found fault with their conduct. As far as I know, Mr. Decelles is a good and efficient officer, and he had had some experience in the Library, and, I have no doubt, would have made a very satisfactory Librarian. If they did not choose to appoint him, it was open to them at that time to have appointed some English speaking gentleman as Librarian, and to have continued Mr. Decelles as Assistant Librarian. I do not think that that could be looked upon as a great wrong to Mr. Decelles, because he had not been very long in the Library himself. A Government, which transacted business in a businesslike way would have adopted either one of those courses, either appointed Mr. Decelles as Librarian, and some English-speaking gentleman as Assistant, or appointed an English-speaking Librarian and continued Mr. Decelles

as Assistant. The Government instead of doing that procrastinated. The procrastination of the head of the Government has become proverbial; and I regret to say that the effect of his procrastination as a rule is, not that things are better done than if he had acted promptly, but they are done in almost the worst possible way. Some eminent man, whose name I do not remember, once remarked: "Time and I against any two": the motto of the head of the Government is pretty much the same, and time and he together produce the most unsatisfactory results when they are combined. The gentleman to be appointed Parliamentary Librarian was for many years a personal friend of mine, and I am very glad indeed that he is going to receive a good appointment; but at the same time that fact does not blind me to the objectionable nature of this Bill. If the Government thought he was the man to be librarian they might have appointed him last winter, and if he was not to be the man to be librarian they might have appointed him assistant and made Mr. Decelles librarian. I was under the impression that one of the great objects of bringing the Maritime Provinces into the Union with Upper and Lower Canada was to get rid of this system of having two heads to every Department, and I am very sorry to see that now, after 18 years of Confederation, we are going back to the old objectionable system. If the Government felt that it was desirable to appoint Mr. Decelles Librarian and to appoint an officer of a special character, they might have appointed the other gentleman assistant Librarian, and given him charge in a special manner of the parliamentary works in the Library, and I for one should not, under those circumstances, have objected seriously to giving the assistant Librarian and Parliamentary Librarian a salary larger than that provided by the Act of 1871; but as it is, I shall feel obliged to vote against this Bill because it is going to lead to very considerable and unnecessary expense, and because it is going to give us less efficiency and probably a good deal of difficulty and trouble in the conduct of the Library.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I do not think I would have said a word on this Bill but for the observation which the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has made, and which I cannot let go without a reply. The hon. gentleman states that Mr. Decelles has not been long in the service, and that he could have remained as assistant, and that another gentleman speaking the English language could have been appointed as Librarian. I am quite opposed to that principle. When the Government make an appointment they should select a good man, and if the appointments are good, promotion ought to be the general rule. Either Mr. Decelles was fit to be appointed to the position he has held for years, or he was not. If he was not, the Government did wrong to appoint him, and both Houses of Parliament ought to have taken a stand on the matter. But it is very well known that Mr. Decelles was fit for the position, and that he ought to have been promoted.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—But that is not what the hon. gentleman said; he said either to do this or the other. I say the other thing could not be done without doing injustice, and Parliament ought not to be unjust. Now, as to this Bill, I am happy to see that the Government have determined not to set Mr. Decelles completely aside because he is a French-speaking gentleman; but I must say this, that the Government have shown in this instance that a Frenchman, however clever he may be, has never full justice done him unless an English-speaking gentleman receives equal recognition. If two heads are necessary in the Library now, they were necessary in the time of Mr. Todd. If two are not necessary, why did not Mr Decelles receive the appointment? Mr. Decelles is to be promoted now, but the Government had to wait for more than a year to promote him in order that they might appoint with him an English-speaking gentleman. That shows that we have good reason to complain. I have heard it said once or twice in this House, "why speak of French and English; let us all be Canadians." As I said before, we wish to be Canadians. Let the majority act honorably, justly and equitably, and we will all be Canadians together, but when we see such an act as

this, when we find that the full justice which the French-speaking population in this country ought to enjoy in common with Englishmen is denied us, we must lay aside that word Canadian and think that we are descended from French ancestors—from those who came here first—and demand that those who govern the country shall concede to us our rights. If those rights are trampled upon, it is not surprising that we sometimes complain. Has justice been done in this matter? Here is an important position to be filled; there is a deputy Librarian who is quite equal to the position, but before promoting him a way must be found to appoint an English-speaking man to occupy a position equal to his in rank. Now that is not right, and it does not show that we are getting the justice for which we have a right to look. As the hon. member from Halifax says, we have been waiting for twelve months for this appointment to be made. Why? Because when Mr. Todd died the Government were asked in this House how they would deal with the appointment of a successor, and whether Mr. Decelles, a French gentleman, would occupy the position. On account of that difficulty the appointment was delayed from day to day for twelve or rather fifteen months. Now this shows that whenever the French people have a right to an appointment, it is only conceded after long delay. We have another instance in a position not quite so important. A vacancy occurred amongst the messengers in this House, and it was proposed to fill it, but because the older messenger is a Frenchman the question of filling the vacancy has been set aside, and God knows when the position will be filled, except Providence so manage things that that Frenchman would die and give a chance to an Englishman to be promoted. As hon. gentlemen know, when that question came before the Committee on Contingencies, and it was proposed that a messenger speaking the English language should be appointed to fill the vacancy, exception was taken to it because an older messenger was a Frenchman; so it was set aside for another year, and this year not a word has been said about it. These are facts, and I ask, have we not good reason to ignore the fact that we are Canadians and remember only that we are French, and that in this country of ours we have rights equal to those of our fellow citizens of English origin? We speak a language which is recognized as one of the official languages of the country; but the right to speak in the French language is not always admitted and we are treated in such a way as to make us feel every day that we are a minority. We are ready to forget that we are French or English. We are ready to remember only that we are Canadians, but let the majority of the Dominion follow the example of the majority of the province of Quebec in their treatment of a minority. In the province of Quebec we hear of no difficulties. Why? Because the English minority have no cause to complain, because they are given all their rights, and more. They are given so much that they refuse part of what is conceded to them. Is there not a law in existence to give a superintendent of education to the minority of the province of Quebec? Why have they not availed themselves of it? Because they say it is not necessary—that they are all so well treated by the majority in the province of Quebec that they do not require a superintendent of education for themselves. Treat us in the same way and we will not complain; but as long as we are dealt with as we have been hitherto, there are men who will be ready to fight for their rights, and to claim all that they are entitled to. I do not make these remarks in any hostile spirit but merely to remind gentlemen that if we sometimes complain it is because we have good cause for complaint. I might speak of the seat on the Treasury benches in this House, now unoccupied, which should be filled by a French member in order that the questions which we ask in one of the official languages might be answered in that language. It has been acknowledged that we should have a representative here speaking our own language; but has that right been conceded yet? It has not been done, though the failure to do it is recognized as a violation of the spirit of the constitution; and if we can trample upon one part of the constitution then any and all of it may be disregarded. I say that we ought to stand by our constitution; if we do so I believe that we will have no cause to complain, and

gentlemen in this House and other parts of the Dominion will hear no more of those complaints—complaints which for my own part I do not like to utter, and which gentlemen in this House are not very pleased to hear, but which, I hope, they will have the justice to admit are only too well founded.

HON. MR. POWER—I wish to say a word or two in explanation. The hon. gentleman from DeLanaudiere seems to have misapprehended what I said. I did not at all object to the appointment of Mr. Decelles. I said on the contrary that as far as I knew, Mr. Decelles was perfectly qualified to act as Librarian, and I went on to add that if the Government did not think fit to appoint him as Librarian they might appoint another gentleman. The compromise I suggested, and I think after the long delay it would have been the proper course to have adopted, was to appoint Mr. Decelles as Librarian and appoint another gentleman as his assistant in charge of the Parliamentary Library, at a good salary. As to the charge of want of fair play that the French-Canadians meet with in the Senate, I think the hon. gentleman has no ground for the somewhat vigorous language he has used. I have had occasion to look over a statement showing the number of employes in this House and their salaries, and I find that the French-Canadian employees of the Senate are to-day receiving a larger amount for salaries than the English employes.

HON. MR BELLEROSE—In reply to the hon. gentleman I would call his attention to the fact that two years ago a return was moved for, of all the officers employed by the Government throughout the Dominion, showing their nationality and salaries received, and it was found that the French-Canadians did not have half the number of appointments, according to population, that they are entitled to.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I should have supposed, after listening to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, that this new arrangement proposed for the management of the Library bore with peculiar hardship upon the French-Canadian section of the Dominion; but I cannot understand that that is in any way the case, seeing that a French-gentleman is to be appointed to the high position of joint Librarian, and consequently it appears to me that the hon. gentleman's habit of complaining of hardships received by his compatriots has become chronic with him, and he cannot rise to his feet without making some complaint of this kind.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—In the same way as it has become chronic with the hon. gentleman to be unjust.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Speaking seriously it seems to me we are about to adopt a course which is the very worst we could adopt. The first clause in this Bill, it appears to me, displays just about as little tact or management as it is possible to conceive could be shown in adopting a new system fot the management of such a heretofore well conducted establishment as our parliamentary library has been. I do not think it would be easy to mention any instance in which a joint management of this kind has ever been successful—whether it has been in the Government of the country or the government of a Department, or in any other way. If you put two men in the same office with joint authority, and equal powers, it is almost inevitably the case that that joint management will prove unsuccessful, and if it should not be so in this case, it will be worthy of note. This Bill does not even set forth the particular departments which each of the librarians is to preside over. They are appointed under joint commission, under the great seal, and they are to have co-ordinate powers. It is stated that one of them is to be the Librarian of Parliament, and that the other is to be the general Librarian, but it does not define what those separate duties are. We may assume from our own experience of what those duties consist, but surely they ought to be set forth in this clause so that there can be no doubt when those gentleman are appointed and inducted into their offices, as to what their particular duties will be in the future. They are to have equal powers; but their separate duties are not defined. Of course, one can imagine that some member of the Government when those appointments are presented, will

lead those gentlemen into the library and say "gentlemen here is the library, one of you is to be Parliamentary Librarian and the other is to be a General Librarian," but you have no further power to go beyond that. You may assume power and tell this gentleman who is Parliamentary Librarian that he is to devote his time and attention to such and such details, and tell the General Librarian that he is to devote his attention to such other details; but there is nothing in the Bill to indicate what those duties are. Take, for example, one of the most important duties of the Librarian, and it will be easy for the House to see what a difficult position it is for those gentlemen to be put in. Take the selection of books in the first instance, a duty that has always been in an obscure condition. I have been a member of the Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament, since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, and have taken great interest in it, and I know from experience that the selection of books is one of the most important and difficult duties to perform in relation to it, and that it is hard to say who performs that duty. During a recent session the Library Committee appointed sub-committees to perform this duty, and they were directed in the recess to examine the catalogues and take any other means within their power to make selections of books and make recommendations to the committee sitting at Ottawa. I believe, out of all those committees, only two or three gentlemen took any active part in performing the duties assigned to them. I made some recommendations myself, and I find several books that I recommended have been selected and are in the library. I know that great dissatisfaction is generally expressed at new books which we find in the library from year to year. I think I may say without any reproach to the memory of the late Mr. Todd that it has been the case, and that we have found from year to year books in our library which do not meet with our approbation. They may be very useful books, but are not such volumes as we would expect and hope to find on the shelves of a parliamentary library. If this has been the case under single management how much greater must be the difficulties under the double management proposed by this Bill. I think it will be a great misfortune for the library of parliament if this Bill becomes law. Double responsibility seems to me to be almost no responsibility at all. I would prefer to see Mr. Decelles or any other French gentleman of competent requirements appointed as librarian, than to see two gentlemen appointed, one of English and one of French extraction, with equal powers. Of the two I would prefer to see a competent French gentleman appointed sole head of the library than to see the proposal of this Bill carried into effect.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think the change is so great as the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island supposes, or that the expense will be so great as the hon. gentleman from Halifax alleges. The present staff consists almost of the same number as the staff proposed under this Bill, and the salaries that are paid at present are not the salaries which are mentioned in the original Act, which the hon. gentleman has read—the salaries paid to-day to the staff are much larger. There are now in the Library six clerks exclusive of the Librarian, and exclusive of the Assistant Librarian. Including the Librarian and the Assistant Librarian there are eight. Under this Bill there would be nine. Therefore there would be an increase of one, and the two Librarians would get $6,000. At this moment the salary of the principal Librarian is $3,200, and the assistant is getting $2,400, or a total of $5,600. Under the new Bill the two chief officers will be paid $6,000, the difference being $400, so that there is no great discrepancy there, and no great increase to be commented upon very severely. Then the House must bear in mind that the service is continually increasing. The number of members of Parliament is much greater now than it was when that Act was passed. The Library was then small, and was contained in one building where the reading room now is. The number of references has also increased by the increased number of members who resort to the Library, and not only increased by the number of members, but increased by the number of gentlemen who have business with the

members, and a great many others connected with Parliamentary affairs who resort to the Library, and who also require a certain amount of service and civility from the officers in charge, so that we must all acknowledge that the duties of the officers have increased. Then with reference to the appointment of an English and French Librarian, those who live in the old Province of Canada must remember that such an appointment is not an uncommon thing. We have, in the City of Quebec and various other cities, offices held by two persons, representatives of the two races; you have even a joint sheriff and a joint prothonotary, and it is often found convenient. We had, in the old Province of Canada, two librarians. We had a librarian appointed by the House of Commons and a librarian appointed by the Legislative Council, and there was no discord or want of harmony on that account, and there was in that case no definition of the duties to be performed by either—they were joint librarians, with joint and equal authority, and yet there was no want of harmony, and the service was performed well, and I do not remember of any evils having occurred from that system.

HON. MR. POWER—One acting for the Senate and one for the House of Commons.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There was nothing for them to do for the Senate particularly, or nothing to do for the Commons as distinct from the Senate. If a member of the Commons wished to go to the library for information, he would go with equal ease and with equal facility to Rev. Dr. Adamson, the father of our present assistant clerk, as to Mr. Todd, for advice or assistance; and in the same way if a gentleman from the Senate went to the library he would go to Mr. Todd, or to Dr. Adamson, whose service was rendered with cordiality at all times, and no difficulty of the kind now suggested ever occurred. Here we are a joint race, and things cannot be managed in the same way perhaps as they would be managed in an exclusively English speaking province of the Dominion. There are two races to be consulted, and the convenience of two races to be thought of, and an endeavour to be made to promote the convenience of both. The appointment of a single librarian there would probably have been attended with more or less inconvenience. At all events it is more convenient for the two races to have a representative of each in the Library. The hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island says he would rather have a French speaking gentleman appointed as Librarian than to see two Librarians, one English and one French, appointed with co-ordinate powers. It may be the fact, however, that it is more convenient for those gentlemen who resort to the Library to have a representative of each race to consult with. The appointment involves a very small additional sum of money, and we have already instances of the office being held jointly without inconvenience, and we have instances of other offices being held jointly in Quebec without inconvenience. Then with reference to the fact that we have not appointed an English Librarian as soon as we might have appointed him, of course the action of Government is open to that remark, but there is always difficulty in those matters, as those who have been in the Government know, which causes delay. The hon. gentleman from Halifax suggests that the delay on the part of the Government and of the head of the Government has accomplished a good deal. No doubt it has, but those delays are often governed by sound judgment. We are not all gifted with that impetuosity of youth which influences the hon. member from Halifax. These matters take time, and we may perhaps do quite as well in the long run as the hon. gentleman would do, with all his youth and impetuosity. I do not think the change proposed will be very great, and I apprehend that the service will be as satisfactorily and as faithfully performed as it can be under the Bill now before us.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (144) "An Act

to authorize the augmentation of the North-West Mounted Police." He said—This is a Bill to increase the mounted police which now consists of 500 men, to 1000. It provides that the Governor-in-Council shall be and is hereby empowered to authorize, from time to time, the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police to increase the present number of constables to one thousand men, and to appoint from among them non-commissioned officers of different grades, and to appoint supernumerary constables not to exceed in the whole twenty men, and to employ not more in the whole than fifty men as scouts; and such constables and scouts shall be paid the same rates of pay now authorized by law for the present force. I understand from the Premier that it is the intention to increase the force up to 800 as soon as possible.

HON. MR. POWER—In moving the second reading of a Bill of such great consequence as this, and involving so much additional expenditure, the Minister of Justice might have given us a little more information as to what the additional expenditure will be. I did not hear the debate, and have not read the report of it, but there was quite a long discussion in the other Chamber on the subject, and I think the Minister of Justice should have given us a little more information here. One reason why I say that is, that I see that the Government propose to increase the standing army to 1,000 men. The force is now I think 500 and the Government are taking power under this Bill to increase the Mounted Police also to 1000. That is going to involve, speaking roughly —those two measures together—a yearly expenditure of about $1,000,000 in addition to that which the country is now at to keep up the Mounted Police and the standing army, and I think that a little more might be said about the Bill.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am sorry that I did not give the House all the explanation which the hon. gentleman from Halifax thinks I ought to have given; but it does not seem to me that there is much more to be said. The House knows very well the troubles that have recently occurred in the North-West, and that it is necessary to have a militia force there to deal with those troubles. I might say that it is proposed to bring down all the militia, and to keep at Winnipeg only a military school to consist of two companies of men, and the pupils who may attend for instruction—probably 300 or 400 men—and with those and the Mounted Police it is thought we can maintain order in the North-West. It is necessary in order to enable us to do that, that we should have mounted men, and it is proposed that one of those schools shall be devoted to drilling mounted men, or that it shall be a joint school, part of which will be devoted to drilling mounted men. I do not think, from what we know has recently occurred, that it would be wise to reduce the force below the number I have mentioned. The country to be dealt with is large, the distances are great, and the trouble amongst the Indians, for the moment subdued, may cause some difficulty in the future, and it may be necessary to have a force at command to protect the settlers at any time, and a force that will be very mobile. With reference to the expense, the cost per man will be the same as at present, which is, I think, about $970 per annum. It is a very large sum, certainly. Whether it is too much or not I cannot say, but, of course, it is a just subject of criticism if we are extravagant, or if supplies are not properly bought, and so on.

HON. MR. POWER—The Minister has not referred to the fact that the Government have taken power to increase the standing army to 1000 men also, and I can see no reason for that increase, in addition to the increase in the Mounted Police.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—That in effect goes into the schools. The number of men now in the schools is 750. A new school at Winnipeg of both branches of the service is proposed; and I think it is in contemplation to establish a school in British Columbia and another school in the Province of Quebec, and thus occupy the time and give duty to so many men; and the standing army, so to speak, if it is to be 1000 men would be divided amongst those schools, each school having a company or troop for drilling pupils who come in from the country for that purpose.

When I allude to the school at Winnipeg I describe what is the duty to be performed by some of those men that the hon. gentleman calls the standing army.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I assume that the recent unfortunate events that occurred in the North-West will involve the necessity of our keeping a force in that country for some time to come. It may or may not be, and I am not at this moment prepared to dissent from the wisdom of the policy that looks to augmenting the mounted force instead of the foot. The proposition to increase the Mounted Police to the numbers indicated by the Minister would remove the necessity for raising so large a force as that contemplated and proposed by the legislation of last session with regard to the infantry, because if we look upon the mounted force as the arm in the North-West, then we should not keep up so large a body of infantry. We have seen how readily our volunteers have been grouped together, and how quickly they have been forwarded to the scene of action when necessary, and therefore the existence of volunteers in the country will no doubt relieve us from the absolute necessity of keeping up an infantry force; but the mounted force I regard as a necessity under the present condition of affairs in the North West. My own view of the vulnerable point in this country, and where an armed force has to be preserved, is that it should centre largely in that country, and that the spirit which has been evoked there recently is not one that will be rapidly extinguished. The Indian has to be awed into absolute subjection in order to make that country habitable to the white man, and therefore I consider that the major part of our artillery could be prudently kept in the North-West, either in Winnipeg or some other suitable point where their services I hope will not be required, but where their presence will no doubt assist in preserving the peace in the future until that country gets back to its normal condition; but until that period arrives, I think it would be wise on the part of the Government to station the largest portion of the paid army of Canada in the North-West. We certainly do not need them in the older provinces. There is no spirit there that would likely develop into resistance to constituted authority. No people probably on the face of the earth is disposed to be more peaceable or to accept more readily the laws of the country than the Dominion of Canada, save that section of it which has been recently in armed rebellion; and therefore, except as a school and as an assistance to the training of young men who are sent to Kingston and Quebec, I think the greater portion of the force might very prudently be kept in the North-West for a year or two to come, and in that way a considerable saving might possibly be effected. Even with that I appreciate the fact that we do require a much larger force of Mounted Police in that country than we at present possess, and therefore I think it is the proper policy on the part of the Government to increase that force in the manner indicated.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I am not at all disposed to find any fault with the expenditure necessary to maintain this addition to the force of Mounted Police in the North West Territories. Whether we consider it as a matter of true economy in the long run to do so, or in any other light, I think it is evidently the duty of the Government of this Dominion to propose to Parliament that a sufficient force should be kept on foot to maintain absolute peace in the North-West. Unless that can be accomplished it is useless for us to be building railroads, and inviting settlers to make their homes in that region, when they would be suddenly subjected to such vicissitudes as have occurred there during the last few months. It will be necessary if we intend to call ourselves a rising country. If we are laying the foundations of a Dominion which is to be great and respected amongst nations, we must in time take upon ourselves the responsibilities of preserving the lives and property of our subjects in all parts of the Dominion—preserving their property free from raids, whether of half-breeds, or of Indians, or of discontented, ill-disposed people from beyond our borders. These are so clearly our duties that I cannot see how anybody possessed of feelings of patriotism can hesitate for a moment to pledge the necessary expenditure for this state of things. But as to whether the plan proposed by the Government is the best, or the only plan to be adopted, we

are of course welcome to entertain our own opinions, and, on an occasion like this, to offer them publicly, whether they be accepted in the light of advice or not. It seems to me that the North-West Mounted Police, thoroughly organized should be a highly efficient body of men; but we must recollect, on the other hand, that there is an enormous extent of country over which their operations may be called upon to extend, and for that reason the small force of 1,000 men may be broken up into comparatively small parties, and therefore I can readily perceive myself that the preservation and the maintenance of peace in the North-West is not so easy a matter as may casually appear. One thousand mounted police, kept within a day's march of each other, would be a formidable body, but they would be comparatively useless if an outbreak occurred at a distance of two or three days' march from them. It does appear to me that no force can be more properly called upon to assist in the maintenance of peace and the preservation of order in a country of that kind than the male inhabitants themselves, of a certain age; and my opinion is that it is the duty of the Government to organize in those territories an efficient body of mounted men who shall be available at all times to act in their own defence and in defence of the adjoining regions—not merely in the immediate vicinity of their own location, but wherever they may be called upon in time of trouble such as has occurred within the last few weeks. It appears from recent experience in the warfare of older countries where armies of considerable discipline and numbers have been engaged, that the most efficient arm in modern warfare is the mounted infantry. It seems rather a misnomer or a Hibernianism to speak of a "mounted infantry man;" still that is the name which has been adopted, and it seems to me that for the North-west service a body of mounted militia would be the force best calculated to maintain peace. My hon. friend who has just resumed his seat has mentioned the desirability of the artillery force being available there. That, no doubt, is a most important suggestion. We, all of us, have had an opportunity of reading of the effect produced upon the minds of the Indians and others who were opposed to our army in the North-West, of artillery fire—particularly of shells, and also the effect of the Gatling guns. It would seem, in order to make whatever force is employed in the North-West fairly effective, it should be supported both by artillery and Gatling guns of the most modern and useful type. Seeing that the Militia Department of the Government has shown considerable aptitude in carrying on the details of warfare—the office details —it may not be misapprehended if one ventures to offer a few suggestions of this nature on this occasion. I myself think that although the increase in the Mounted Police is a very useful and necessary measure, it should be accompanied by the establishment of volunteer Mounted Police in that country, and that forts will be required where a comparatively small body of men can be in perfect safety against the attack of much larger numbers. The want of such places was quite evident during the late outbreak. The so-called forts of the country were, as I understood, nothing better than log houses with wooden stockades, but had our few police and available forces been able to retire on certain occasions within properly constructed fortifications, some of the disasters we met with would have been avoided, and it is certain that the knowledge of the existence of such places would give a feeling of security to the whole country. It would not be merely the military of the country, who would feel that their security was cared for, but it would be the farmers and other inhabitants of the country also, the women and children and ecclesiastics. If such places existed, to which people could retire with perfect security in case of an outbreak, there would be a feeling of confidence in the country which is perhaps rather lacking at present. These ideas occur to me, and I must say I think such precautions are necessary, in taking into consideration the protection of life and property in that country. For example, in arming the militia in that country a great risk would be run of the arms being stolen, suppose they were left in the keeping of the different members of the force. They are frequently absent from their homes, either in the fields or away from their farms for a few days, leaving their houses quite undefended. A body of turbulent Indians

might be disposed for an outbreak and make a raid for the arms of the settlers, but the existence of fortified strongholds in those places, where the arms could be deposited, would obviate any difficulty of that sort, and I think, besides the actual security which would be afforded, that it would have a beneficial effect in infusing amongst the settlers a feeling that they were citizens of the country, having their duties to perform as well as their privileges to enjoy, and when this state of things should have supervened for a few years, we should find the feelings and the condition of a much older country growing up amongst our people in the North-West. I am glad, on the whole, that the Government have taken this step of increasing the North-West Mounted Police force, but I think it might be supplemented by other measures in the same direction with advantage both to the present security of the country and to its future progress.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I do not think it would be possible in the present state of the North-West to get a large volunteer force. It would be a great burden on the sparse population, and I doubt if it would be practicable at all. As to the forts to which the hon. gentleman refers, they were Hudson Bay trading posts, and were never supposed or believed to be regular fortifications. Nobody was deceived with the idea that they were. I am very glad indeed to find that a bill for increasing the force has been met in so kindly and generous a spirit by the gentlemen on the opposite side. The need is apparent, and I think every one feels that it will be absolutely necessary to see that there is sufficient force in the North-West to overawe any turbulent spirits that may be there and may be inclined to set the laws of the country at defiance. I am very glad to hear my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island speak in so kindly a manner of the efficient way in which arms and men and the munitions of war were sent into that country on the occasion of the late outbreak there. It is a strong contrast to the action of older countries that have been suddenly brought face to face with the disasters of war, that a young country like this, with almost no preparation, was ready at such a moment and in such an efficient way to meet so grave an exigency as that which threatened the country. I have no doubt that we have seen the last of that serious difficulty. There may be some few Indians that have not yet been taught by the disasters which have befallen their people, that they cannot defy the power of the Dominion Government with impunity. They will be taught, and I imagine that the difficulties which have arisen will be removed by the augmentation of the force as we have it now. I doubt if it will be possible to get up a volunteer force without a very much larger expense than, I fancy, hon. gentlemen would be willing to incur. I presume that for the present we will have to be contented with the increase of the Mounted Police which will, I suppose, add nearly seven or eight hundred thousand dollars to the expense with which the public is already burdened for the purpose.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time at length.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, DRUGS AND AGRICUTURAL FERTILIZERS BILL.

COMMONS AMENDMENTS AGREED TO.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the amendments made by the House of Commons to Bill (W), "An Act respecting the adulteration of food, drugs and agricultural fertilizers" be concurred in. He explained that all the changes were in accord with the general object of the Act and merely for the purpose of making it more complete.

HON. MR. POWER suggested that the amendment to the 26th clause contained an inaccuracy. As it read, it referred to the 27th clause, but it seemed to him that it was intended to refer to the 25th clause.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the House concur in all the amendments except the amendment of the 26th clause.

The motion was agreed to.

CANNED GOODS BILL.

COMMONS AMENDMENTS CONCURRED IN.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the amendments made by the House of Commons to Bill (U), "An Act respecting Canned Goods" be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (135), "An Act further to amend the General Inspection Act, 1874, and the Acts amending the same."

In the Committee,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There were two or three points as to which I was to obtain further information with regard to this Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—The Minister said he would consider the propriety of amending the affidavit.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I did consider that and wrote out another form of affidavit, but I find that the one which is here expresses with sufficient clearness what the object is—that is, that the officer shall not undertake to stamp any goods in which he has an interest, except as permitted by the Act.

HON. MR. POWER—I did not say there was anything incorrect in the clause, but I suggested that the inspectors, not being familiar with legal phraseology, might not apprehend the meaning.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Then, as to sub-section 4, I promised to make some inquiry. I find as to that sub-section the suggestion is that if a dispute occurs between the owner and an inspector in a place where there is a Chamber of Commerce then it shall be disposed of in the manner provided in the section. If it occurs in a place where there is no Chamber of Commerce, then it is to be disposed of as provided in section 11. I do not see that we can improve on that. Then the hon. member from Halifax asked if all these provisions had received the sanction of the Halifax Chamber of Commerce. I understand one of them was not in the Bill when the Chamber of Commerce saw it—that is sub-section 6, which is a provision for referring the matter to the chief inspector; but that is optional and it need not be used unless the parties agree.

HON MR. POWER—That is a very good provision—there can be no objection to that.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Then as to the compulsory clause, which really was the principal point objected to, my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Howlan) took strong objections to that clause, and I was very much interested in what he said, and affected by his argument considerably, but on inquiring into it, I find that in the island from which he comes there never has been an inspector, or deputy inspector, appointed under the Act, so that from 1874 to the present time—11 years—they have never felt any inconvenience from want of inspection, and never derived any benefit from inspection under the Act, so that would show very conclusively that, so far as Prince Edward Island goes, compulsory inspection has not been enforced there.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—The reason it has never been applied for is this: they had, previous to entering Confederation, a good inspection law, and had inspectors and deputy inspectors under whom they had been acting.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—They had voluntary inspection only, and that voluntary inspection they can continue to have under this Bill. I find also that the point was submitted to a meeting of all the representatives of the Maritime Provinces in the other branch of Parliament, at a private meeting—I suppose I am quite right in mentioning this. At that meeting, with the exception of a single individual, all the members from

the Maritime Provinces agreed that this compulsory part of the Act should be done away with. There was a very strong expression of opinion from those who know best as to the merit or demerit of the compulsory clause, and it was expressed, as I am told, almost unanimously—there was but one exception. Those are very strong arguments—there has been no compulsory inspection in Prince Edward Island, and they have done very well without it, so well that they desire to remain without it; and that the members from the Maritime Provinces, with the exception of one voice, agree that the compulsory inspection clause is not necessary. Then we must bear in mind the thing will remedy itself if we are going wrong, because the machinery is provided for the inspection. If a man packing fish finds that inspection would be a benefit to him he can get it; if he finds that it is no benefit to him then under this Bill he will not be compelled to have them inspected. That is the state of the law which those most interested and experienced in the trade, and who know better than we do in this part of the Dominion, desire and think best for the Maritime Provinces. These reasons make me satisfied that the clause as it is is the one which is most consonant with the general condition of those concerned in the business, and it has the advantage of the experience to which I have referred, and I therefore am unwilling to change it.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Who was the single individual who objected at this meeting?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I did not like to ask his name, and if I had learned it I should not like to mention it. I have mentioned the fact that there was a meeting of all the members of the Maritime provinces in the other House, and that there was but one exception to the decision they arrived at, that this compulsory clause was not desirable.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I heard of the meeting and I took the liberty of inquiring the name of the gentleman who dissented from their conclusion. I found that he was from Prince Edward Island, and is a gentleman who has had a good deal of experience in the fish business. He told me that he was the one who had objected; but in contradistinction to the views of the members who have been referred to, I have the opinion of gentlemen engaged practically every day in the fishing industry —members of the Board of Trade of Halifax —and they are unanimously in favor of compulsory inspection. With regard to the Province of Prince Edward Island, an Act was passed in 1865 under which inspectors and deputy inspectors were appointed, and they have had their brands and have been working in that way ever since. They have never, therefore, felt the necessity of applying for compulsory inspection.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Then there is no occasion to make it compulsory.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—All those who are engaged in the business have continued to use barrels of the dimensions and capacity etc., specified, and that is the reason why. I believe my hon. friend was himself the Minister when the first Inspection Act was brought in for Canada. It was looked upon as a very perfect Act and it is the one under which we have been working ever since. There has been no petition, so far as I know, from those particularly engaged in the fisheries for doing away with compulsory inspection. I have not seen or heard of any of them, and when we have the opinion—the best we can possibly get, I consider—of the Halifax Board of Trade, we should listen to it in preference to acting in accordance with the views of parties who are not practical.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not attach quite as much weight to the opinion of the meeting the Minister refers to, as the hon. gentleman seems to do. In the first place I presume that whoever represented the Department of Inland Revenue there intimated a very decided opinion as to compulsory inspection. The suggestion came from him and not from the members.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, it was the other way.

HON. MR. POWER—Excuse me; I think I am right about that. I find—I

did not know it before—that a member from Prince Edward Island objected.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Yes.

HON. MR. POWER—Then there must be some error in the statement communicated to the Minister of Justice, because I am aware that a member who attended at that meeting, who represents the most important fishing county in the whole province of Nova Scotia, also objected. Take, for instance, the county of Halifax; the two members who represent that county concurred in the suggestion of the Department. Neither of these gentlemen is in any way connected with the fishing business. One is a lawyer and the other is a gentleman engaged in the manufacture of cordage, but the Chamber of Commerce, made up chiefly of merchants, and largely of men who make their living from dealing in fish, unanimously, at a very large meeting, asked that this provision be stricken out of the Bill, and now you have the fact that this body, composed of men who are supposed to know as much about the fish trade as any body in Canada, are opposed to the views of the members from the county. We have the fact that one member from Prince Edward Island, who is familiar with the business, took the same view that the Chamber of Commerce did, and the fact that a representative of the largest fishing county in Nova Scotia agrees with him. If these gentlemen desired to have the law altered something might be said, but they are asking that the law remain as it has been for the last forty years, and I think the Government should not make the change. I attempted yesterday to give the reason why I thought the time was not well chosen to make the change. Our treaty with the United Staies has just ceased. Our fish will go into the American market meeting a heavy duty. I may mention that the fish as to which the difficulty has generally occurred is mackerel, and that for our mackerel in Nova Scotia—which is the great mackerel-catching province, together with Prince Edward Island—practically the only market we have is Boston. Under our inspection law our fish have established a good reputation in that market. If you abolish compulsory inspection, and the fish go in there subject to a duty of $2 per barrel, and they also go in diminished in value by the want of the guarantee which the inspection has hitherto given, and that all happens at a time when mackerel are exceptionally low in the market, I think the effect will be most injurious to our fishermen. The Minister has said there is no difficulty about it; if the inspection is found advantageous, it can be continued. But there is this answer to that; unfortunately fishermen, perhaps to a greater extent than farmers and other classes, do not see what is for their own ultimate good. A fisherman may, for the sake of saving the ten cents immediate expenditure which it would involve to have a barrel of mackerel inspected, lose 50 cents on a barrel of mackerel. I think, in the interests of the fishermen and of the merchants, it would be better to leave the law as it is now, and if it is found after a couple of years that the law, with the amendments made by this Bill, does not work satisfactorily, then this change could be made; but I regret that the hopes we entertained yesterday that the Minister would consent to the slight change which has been suggested do not seem to be realised.

HON. MR. CARVELL—I am very glad to find that the minister has seen fit to present the Bill in its present form, making inspection non-compulsory. I think we are altogether too much inspected in this country. The department which has charge of inspection seems to have gone wild. What in the world the department of Inland Revenue has to do with inspection I cannot imagine. However, they are as well able to regulate it as any one else. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down speaks of the loss our fishermen sustain by our fish going uninspected to Boston, which is the largest, almost our only, fish market. The value of inspection is simply nothing. Perhaps there are 40 or 60 different establishments around our coast, and each man procures an appointment for himself to inspect his own fish. They go to Boston; perhaps a steamer arriving there will have 1,500 to 2,000 barrels of mackerel on board. Many buyers will say, "Have you any of Dan Ross' on board, or any of Churchill's fish?" These are the fishermen who have made

names for themselves and their reputation will sell fish when no amount of inspection or branding the barrels will do any good whatever. Inspection does not amount to anything in the Boston market.

HON. MR. DEVER—It is a mere farce

HON. MR CARVELL—It would be very much better to leave it optional.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I do not agree with the hon. gentleman at all. I can assure him that if he would put a lot of Dan Ross' or Churchill's fish—and they are very good fish indeed, I am well acquainted with both gentlemen and know the way they put up their fish—if they would put them in the market without a compulsory inspection law alongside of fish inspected under a compulsory inspection law, he would very soon get an answer that would satisfy him.

The clause was adopted.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend from Halifax asked me to ascertain why the price for inspecting herrings had been increased from 5 to 7 cents. I find the reason is the charge of 5 cents was so small that they could not get the work done, and the charge of 7 cents is as low as it can be done; and so with the half barrel, 4 cents. In other fish no change has been made except to reduce the rates. That is the explanation which has been given me.

The clause was adopted.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE, from the Committee, reported the Bill with amendments, which were concurred in.

The Bill was then read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (134) "An Act respecting the Liquor License Act, 1883." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

Bill (150) "An Act to authorize the advance of a certain sum to the Harbor Commissioners of Three Rivers." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

The Senate adjourned at 5 o'clock.

HON. MR. CARVELL.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Monday, July 6th, 1885.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

PETITION PRESENTED.

HON. MR. VIDAL presented a petition from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Canada. He said: I would like to read this petition, inasmuch as it has reference to a measure that is on our orders to be disposed of to-day:—

"*To the Honorable the Senate of Canada:*

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada assembled in Montreal this 16th day of June in the year 1885, respect fully submit to your honorable body, that

Whereas your honorable body have lately framed amendments to the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 permitting the sale of light wines, ale and beer: thus, in the opinion of your petitioners destroying the usefulness of the Act as a prohibitory measure, and that in opposition to the will of the people so recently expressed at the polls as provided for by said Act;

Therefore, your petitioners respectfully request your honorable body to reconsider said amendments, and to make no change in the Act except in the direction of strengthening its prohibitory character and increasing the facilities for enforcing it.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray, etc., etc.

In the name of the Presbyterian General Assembly,

ALEXANDER MCKNIGHT, D. D., Moderator.

WILLIAM REID, D. D., } Clerks of
WILLIAM FRASER, D.D., } General Assembly.

Montreal, June 16th, 1885.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the meeting was unanimous.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I could not say. Resolutions were passed by a very large majority, and this petition was authorized to be sent and presented to Parliament.

WESTERN TERMINUS OF PACIFIC RAILWAY.

MOTION.

HON. MR. McINNES (B. C.) moved:

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General; praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before this House, copies of all correspondence or telegrams received from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Legislature of British Columbia or any of their officials, addressed to the Railway Department, or any member of the Privy Council, respecting the Western Terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Port Moody, Coal Harbor or English Bay.

He said: In order that hon. gentlemen may have a more intimate knowledge of the subject under consideration I would ask the indulgence of the House for a short time while I outline the history and causes which led to the selection of the Burrard Inlet route and Port Moody as the western terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. On the 1st of July 1871, just 14 years ago last Wednesday, British Columbia became a part and parcel of our wide-spread Dominion, and every hon. gentleman who took the slightest interest in the negotiations at that time between the province of British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada will remember that the principal condition in the terms of union, in fact I may say the principal inducement that was held out to the Pacific province to join the Confederation, was the building of the Pacific Railway, and by that means giving the people of the Pacific province direct communication with her sister provinces east of the Rocky Mountains and with the outside world generally. Another important clause in the terms of union was that actual construction was to commence within two years after the union, and the entire road from the Atlantic to the Pacific was to be completed within ten years. In order that that particular part of the agreement with British Columbia should be carried out the Federal Government the following spring, with commendable promptitude, placed a large number of exploring and surveying parties in the Rocky, Selkirk, and Coast or Cascade ranges of mountains in order to find the best possible railway route to the Pacific Ocean. There were two rival routes, namely, the Bute Inlet or northern route, and the Burrard Inlet or southern route, which was eventually adopted in the year 1877. After the first year's explorations the southern route was virtually abandoned for a period of nearly four years, abandoned I believe, owing to the unwarrantable representations made by Mr. Marcus Smith, then chief engineer on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and others. Owing to those representations, the Macdonald Government of that day and the Mackenzie Government that succeeded it in the fall of 1873, were strongly biased in favor of the northern, or abandoned route, and any gentleman who has the slightest doubt in his mind as to the accuracy of that statement will have his doubts removed by referring to a speech delivered by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, I think in the session of 1879 or 1880, in which he acknowledges its correctness. This condition of affairs continued until the fall of 1876 until $2,000,000 was expended, and four precious years were wasted in a vain endeavor to find a practicable pass through the different ranges of mountains to the tidal waters at Bute Inlet. Fortunately for the Pacific Province and for the Dominion generally, this unsatisfactory state of affairs was suddenly brought to a close by the timely visit of the justly popular and astute Lord Dufferin, then Governor-General of Canada. That nobleman honored the Pacific Province, or the western gate of the Dominion, with a visit in the fall of 1876, and took in at a glance the muddled condition of railway matters, and immediately on his return here he advised his Government that a thorough survey of the southern or Burrard Inlet route should be made at the earliest possible moment. The advice of that nobleman was taken, and the consequence was that the following year nearly all the surveying and exploring parties were placed on the southern route, and in the year 1877, or early in the spring of 1878, the Government of the day adopted the southern or Burrard Inlet route, and declared Port Moody to be the western terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The gradients on the route adopted were found to be very much lower than those on the northern. The cost was variously estimated at from $15,000,000 to $20,-

000,000 less, and the length of the road was shortened some 300 miles. When the Mackenzie Government adopted Port Moody as the western terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway they did not do so merely because it was the first point at which the tidal waters of the Pacific were touched, as alleged by many of the opponents of that place, but on account of its being declared by the highest naval authorities to be the best harbor to be found on the Pacific coast. That was the reason, and I believe the only reason, why Port Moody was selected instead of English Bay and Coal Harbor. When the present Government came into power did they question the wisdom of their predecessors in selecting Port Moody as the terminus? No, on the contrary they, in unmistakeable language, endorsed the selection of their predecessors, and in confirmation of what I have just stated I will read an extract or two from a speech delivered last year in the House of Commons by Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways. I will only read that portion of the speech which has a direect bearing on the question under consideration. Sir Charles Tupper, some three years before that, had paid a visit to British Columbia and made a critical examination of Port Moody, Coal Harbor and English Bay, and knew precisely what he was speaking about. The portion of the speech to which I refer will be found in the Commons Hansard of 1884, page 420, and in order to put it in a more convenient form I have had it struck off, as I found that all the copies of the report of last year were out of the Library. The hon. gentleman's remarks were made in reply to Mr. Blake, who probably had a little more forethought than others, and was contending at the time that the road would probably be eventually taken down to English Bay or Coal Harbor, and that the extra charge or cost would become a burden on the country. This is the reply that Sir Charles Tupper made :—

As to whether Port Moody or English Bay is the best port for the terminus, all I can say is that the Government selected Port Moody as the terminus of the railway, and in doing so they selected a port accessible from the Pacific Ocean and which is declared to be the best port that is to be found on the Pacific coast. Her Majesty's vessels have, during the past year, surveyed the harbor, and we have the declaration of the officers who have been there, and they are the most perfectly independent and able sources of information, that we have made the most wise and judicious selection which could have been made; that the port is simply perfect, and that there is nothing on the Pacific coast superior to it. And they have now represented to the Admiralty the propriety of making Port Moody the head quarters for the admiralty on the Pacific coast, as being the best location which is to be found there. The hon. gentleman, I dare say, (Mr. Blake) would like us to go down to English Bay, because it would have compelled the expenditure of $1,000,000 to get there in the first instance, and another one or two millions to make a harbor out of an open roadstead where there is comparatively no anchorage. I say the Government feel that they have done all that is necessary in relation to the question, when they carried the Canadian Pacific Railway to a terminus which was declared by the highest naval authorities to be unequalled on the Pacific coast.

I need not add anything to these words. The English language, or any other language, fails to put the case stronger than the High Commissioner put it last year when he was speaking, not for himself—not giving his own private opinion—but speaking for the Government.

HON. MR. POWER—He was Minister of Railways.

HON. MR. MCINNES—He was Minister of Railways, and the mouthpiece of the Government at the time. I have another short extract that I will trouble the House with reading; it came from a British Columbia paper, dated the 20th June, and which will bear out the statement made by the Minister of Railways:

COAL HARBOR AGAIN.

Probably nothing could demonstrate so clearly the impossibility of making a place for shipping at Coal Harbor as the recurring disasters which take place at that mockery of a haven. On Wednesday last the ship Albula was driven from her moorings by the heavy winds and tides to which this miserable sheet of water called a harbor, is exposed. The ship, notwithstanding that her anchors were down, fouled the ship Newman Hall at the Hastings wharf, forcing the latter from her berth, and it required the services of a tug for many hours to replace her. This is not the first instance of the kind. We gave the case of the Dorset and the City of Brooklyn; the two vessels were driven up the Inlet, the latter not only dragging her anchors, but carrying away a portion of the wharf also. That any set of men, no matter what their object, could have the temerity to offer lots at

such a place, under the pretence of making a harbor there, is, to say the least, extraordinary.

In this statement of Sir Charles Tupper you will observe that he condemned, not only English Bay in the first place, on account of its being an open roadstead and unworthy of the name of a harbor, but in the second place he calls the attention of the House and of the country—and I want this House to pay particular attention to it—that it would cost from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000 to make a harbor out of an open roadstead. It is doubtless within the knowledge of nearly every gentleman present here that it is contemplated by the Pacific Railway Company, or a portion of the Pacific Railway Company, and a few speculators and adventurers in connection with the Local Government of British Columbia, and a few outsiders, to extend the road down from Port Moody, a distance of some 12 miles, and here the first thing you will find staring you in the face will be a vote of $2,000,000, to make the harbor at English Bay a fit place to anchor in, so that it is not the first cost of the work, but the annual raid that will be made on the treasury of Canada in order to keep that anything like a harbor. I will now trouble you by reading an extract from a paper, in which I must confess I was rather surprised to see it—the paper to which I refer is no less than the Montreal *Herald*, the recognized organ of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It goes on at the first for nearly half the article showing that it is very difficult indeed to protect a city if built on English Bay, and deals in a general way with the military aspect of the terminus and pronounces that Port Moody could be made impregnable—a second Gibraltar. However, I will read the article itself:—

Like almost everywhere else, just now, British Columbia teems with war rumours. Here, perhaps, there are special reasons, consonant with its being the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the jumping-off place of the Dominion of Canada, why there should be excitement. Really, in view of a possible war with Russia, this Pacific coast of Canada is thrust into an importance which it might not otherwise have attained—perhaps for generations. Do people—whether nations or individuals—never learn except by experience? It is to be feared not, at least not very much. My memory recalls that, for years past, among those who have become signalized before the "Royal Colonial Institute," I am not sure that I have got the title right, away out here where I have no means of reference, were several gentlemen of broad nationalistic and patriotic views, who, in their schemes for the consolidation of the British Empire, and its subsequent conservation, touched upon the subject of this Pacific coast—this British Columbia. Eminent among these, I well remember, was Capt in Bedford Pim, who has, again and again, even vehemently urged the fortifying of certain important points upon this—British Columbian—Pacific coast of Canada. It may not be known to every one the importance of this great western outlet of British America being fortified, as it has made itself known to Captain Bedford Pim and many others; but just now, when it may be there is a war pending between Britain and Russia,—whose boundaries, in these countries of "magnificent distances" are so nearly conterminous—the desirability of having some fortified points on this Columbian coast is obvious.

Let us look at what is desirable and what is practicable. What is the defensible condition of Victoria, the capital of this province? It would, perhaps, be a too sweeping remark to say that any place is wholly indefensible, but it would be no very great exaggeration to say as much of Victoria, as of the much talked of harbor of Esquimalt, close by. Of course defensive works could be erected in the vicinity, but to ensure to them anything nearly approaching effectiveness, would necessitate an enormous outlay. Then Victoria is situated at the very extreme outlying point of the province, and its approaches are commanded by foreign—United States—territory; viz, San Juan Island and the Olympic coast, south of the Strait of Juan de Fuca. There, then, the citadel of British Columbia can never be.

Let us look next at those points on the mainland which it is desirable to have effectively fortified. Of course the spot demanding the very first consideration is the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. To leave long unprotected this great western gateway of Canada would be a dereliction of national duty but little short of madness. It happens that here nature has done her part most admirably. It happens, too, that in the surveys about the shores of Burrard Inlet, made in past years, when Colonel Moody here held sway, a wise prescience dictated the reservation against all future private grants of certain commanding points to be held for fortification purposes. Let us make a brief sketch of this maginificent sheet of water and its surroundings. We enter the inlet proper from English Bay, a deep bight of the Gulf of Georgia, some four miles square. It is merely an open roadstead, entirely exposed to what are the most prevalent winds on this coast. We enter what I call Burrard Inlet proper from English Bay, through what

are known as the "First Narrows." This entrance, at its narrowest part, is less than half a mile in width. On its southern side, where the water is deepest—60 fathoms—it is commanded by a bold cliff 180 feet in height. This point has been wisely reserved for fortification purposes; and the sooner defensive works are erected there the better, as it is the seaward key of Burrard Inlet. Passing through this strait we enter the first, or lower basin of the inlet, a fine expanse of water, about five miles in length, by from one to two miles in width, and varying in depth from 20 to 200 fathoms. A deep cove, to the right on entering, and terminating in a sand flat, dry at low water, is locally known as "Coal Harbor." This is the spot of which people speak as the site of the future terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railroad. On the southern site of this basin we find the little village of Granville, and a short distance further up the same shore, the village of Hastings, surrounding the large milling establishment which has created it. From these, waggon roads lead to New Westminster, and to the North Arm of the debouching Fraser. On the northern shore of this basin, and about three miles from its entrance, is the village of Moodyville, surrounding another large saw-milling establishment. Pursuing our course inwards and eastward, we next pass the "Second Narrows." This strait is, at its narrowest part, about half a mile wide. This opens into the Second Basin, which is about four miles in length, with an average width of one mile.

This is a fine harbor throughout, with bold shores, backed by lofty hills, its depth varying from 20 to 150 fathoms with good bottom. At its east end it is joined from the north by what is known as the "North Arm." This deep fijord stretches inland, at nearly righ angles with the corner of Burrard Inlet proper, to a distance of about 15 miles. Its shores are mountains, in some places a mile in height; and it is of vast depth—often over 600 fathoms, with rocky bottom.

Pursuing our way eastward, however, from the Second Basin, we pass through the "Third Narrows" into Port Moody. This entrance at its narrowest point, is not over a quarter of a mile in width. On either side it is overlooked by lofty and precipitous hills; and on both there is a Crown Reserve, intended to be some day crowned with defensive works. These, with what are projected near the mouth of the Inlet, could be made to render Port Moody all but impregnable as to any attack from the seaward direction. As to any attack, across country, from the Fraser River direction, that could be rendered equally difficult. The broad delta of that river consists of low prairie and peat bog, in great part overflowed at certain seasons, through which by several "arms," or channels, the river debouches into the Gulf of Georgia. In accordance with the more modern style of military engineering, the approaches by that route, up as far, say, as New Westminster—over sixteen miles from the mouth—could, with ease, be rendered utterly impracticable to an invading enemy.

HON. MR. MACDONALD — What date is that paper?

HON. MR. MCINNES—It is the 27th April, 1885, so that this was not published before the Pacific Railway Co. had an object in extending their road down there. The article continues:

To return to Port Moody,—this beautiful harbor is about four miles in length; and through the greater port of that distance its width varies from a half to three-quarters of a mile. The depth varies from 12 to 60 fathoms, with good ho'ding ground everywhere. These depths do not refer to the upper part of the harbor, where there is a sand flat, about 700 acres in extent, which becomes dry at low tide. Taking the whole circuit of the harbor, it has at least ten miles of shore line, every yard of it available for the erection of docks, piers, and wharfs,—and available, too, for the easy enjoyment of them when they are constructed. Being so entirely land-locked, its waters are always as smooth as those of the proverbial mill-pond. Upon its north shore, about midway of its length, is another Crown reserve of 95 acres, which, it is understood, is intended for a Royal naval yard. It is seldom that Nature seems to have designed a finer site for a great city than is presented by the immediate surroundings of this harbor, called Port Moody. Regarded from a central point of view, it is a great natural amphitheatre. The near surrounding hills, present, for the most part, a very gentle upward slope from the water side; but even where, at the steepest, there is nothing in the natural grade of the ground to present any obstacles to the opening of streets and the erection of permanent buildings. The highest ground, anywhere within half a mile of the water side, does not exceed 250 feet above sea level—just the elevation of the highest street in New Westminster—just the height of Citadel Hill, Halifax—and still lacking 100 feet of the height of the ramparts of Cape Diamond, the citadel of Quebec. But even these more elevated spurs of hills are usually well back from the shore. As to the picturesque—some of these near and still densely forest-crowned hills are of beautiful contour; but looking beyond them, anywhere towards the north and east, from any street, or projected street, in town, we look upon eternally silver-topped mountain peaks, far, far away, but seeming so near, and from 2,000 to 6,000 feet in height.

I have yet another short extract to read here from another *Herald*, but this happens to be the Halifax Morning *Herald*, and I do not know whether it is recog-

nized as an organ of the Pacific Railway, or not—probably my hon. friend from Halifax can inform me on that point?

HON. MR. POWER—Yes, I presume it is. It is an organ of the Government, and the Government is the organ of the Canadian Pacific Railway Co.

HON. MR. McINNES—The following is the article from the Halifax *Herald*:

Port Moody, the innermost harbor of Burrard Inlet—was years ago fixed upon as the terminus and shipping port of the Canadian Pacific. We, who are intimate with the Atlantic coast of Nova Scotia, might not go into raptures over it—we are so familiar with many of what we justly call "magnificent harbors." Nevertheless, as compared with anything else on this coast, Port Moody is really a magnificent harbor. At first, to a stranger, from a not mountainous country, it seems dwarfed, owing to the elevation of the hills, backed by mountains—some of them a mile high, with tops always silvered with snow—by which it is surrounded. But it is really a very capacious sheet of water, possessing all the requisites of a first-class harbor—depth of water sufficient for the largest ships afloat, the best of anchorage, not a bar or obstructing ledge to be found, and so placid at all times that mere children may, at any time, be trusted to go boating, or canoeing upon it.

Were it not that I am afraid of wearying the House I could go on and read a great number of other reports, reports made by the highest naval authorities, many of those reports written, I believe, even before the Canadian Pacific Railway was thought of, or at least spoken of, and they all bear on the one point: that Port Moody is, without exception, the best port to be found on the Pacific coast. But I think I have given enough to satisfy every hon. member on that point. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that in 1880 a contract for building 127 miles of railway between Yale and Kamloops, in British Columbia, was awarded to Mr. Onderdonk, and a second contract of 90 miles between Port Moody and Yale to the same gentleman in 1882. I am happy to say that those contracts are about completed, and that trains are now running regularly between Port Moody nnd Kamloops, a distance of over 220 miles in the interior of the province. About the time the first named contract was awarded, the Dominion Government took possession of over one mile of the best water frontage on the south side of Port Moody for terminal purposes, and also a large quantity of adjoining land for the same purposes. A large portion of the land lying along the water's edge at Port Moody had been laid out into town lots a considerable length of time previous to the Government taking possession of this water frontage and this land, and many of those lots changed hands several times at high figures, some realizing as much as at the rate of $2,000 and $3,000 an acre; but when the Government took possession of that land the unfortunate investors were compelled to receive payment for it at the rate of $10 per acre. They found that they had no redress; they found that the Government was absolute, and the most of those unfortunate investors had to content themselves with saying, whatever else they may have thought, that they considered themselves very badly treated indeed. Others, a little more demonstrative, had recourse to language which I am afraid would be scarcely considered parliamentary or orthodox. By referring to the terms upon which British Columbia was admitted into the union, it will be found that the province agreed to give a belt of territory some 40 miles wide, extending from English Bay along the line of railway to the eastern boundary of the province. This belt of land was conveyed to the Dominion in 1880 for the specific purpose of aiding and assisting in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as provided for in the terms of union. The conveyance will be found in an Act passed by the Legislature of British Columbia in 1880, and I will read the principal clause which conveys that land. In fact the Act consists of only three clauses, but the main clause is the first after the preamble and is as follows:—

"From and after the passing of this Act there shall be and there is hereby granted to the Dominion Government, for the purpose of constructing and to aid in the construction of the portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway line, located between Burrard Inlet and Yellow Head summit, in trust, to be appropriated in such manner as the Dominion Government may deem advisable, a similar extent of public lands along the line of railway before-mentioned (not to exceed 20 miles on each side of the said line) as may be appropriated for the same purpose by the Dominion from the public lands of the North-

West Territories and the Province of Manitoba, as provided in the order-in-council, section 11, admitting the Province of British Columbia into the Confederation? The land intended to be hereby conveyed is more particularly described in a despatch to the Lieut.-Governor from the Honorable the Secretary of State, dated the 31st day of May, 1878, as a tract of land lying along the line of said railway, beginning at English Bay or Burrard Inlet and following the Fraser River to Lytton; thence by the valley of the River Thompson to Kamloops; thence up the valley of the North Thompson, passing near to Lakes Albreda and Cranberry, to Tete Jaune Cache; thence up the valley of the Fraser River to the summit of the Yellow Head, or boundary between British Columbia and the North-West Territories, and is also defined on a plan accompanying a further despatch to the Lieut.-Governor from the said Secretary of State, dated the 23rd day of September, 1878. The grant of the said land shall be subject otherwise to the conditions contained in the said 11th section of the Terms of Union."

In order to show hon. gentleman that there is nothing conflicting in the 11th section of the terms of union I will read it:—

"The Government of the Dominion undertake to secure the commencement simultaneously within two years from the date of the Union, of the construction of a railway from the Pacific towards the Rocky Mountains, and from such point as may be selected east of the Rocy Mountains towards the Pacific, to connect the sea-board of British Columbia with the railway system of Canada; and further to secure the completion of such railway within ten years from the date of the union.

And the Government of British Columbia agree to convey to the Dominion Government in trust, to be appropriated in such manner as the Dominion Government may deem advisable in furtherance of the construction of the said railway, a similar extent of public lands along the line of railway throughout its entire length in British Columbia, not to exceed, however, 20 miles on each side of said line, as may be appropriated for the same purpose by the Dominion Government from the public lands in the North-West Territories and the province of Manitoba."

Now, that is the only portion of that which has any bearing whatever on the section referred to, so that it does not conflict with the idea that that land is the property of the Dominion Government.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—There is an ambiguity in the conveyance there. It mentions two initial points, and it can be only one point.

HON. MR. MCINNES—I shall refer to that at a later period. Nine years ago, or several years before the Burrard Inlet route was selected, the Federal Government reserved this railway belt—withdrew it from the market so that it could neither be bought, homesteaded or pre-empted—and I am sorry to see that those lands still remain locked up, a sealed book to the present day, and how much longer they are to remain in that condition to the great detriment of the province, I do not know, and will not pretend to predict; but I think it is very unfortunate that those lands have remained in that condition for such a length of time. I certainly think the Government are to blame that they did not do what they agreed to do years ago—to have those lands surveyed and in a condition that immigrants could go and settle upon them. I know—I speak advisedly when I say it—that hundreds, if not thousands of the finest settlers that ever went into any new country—men of capital and experience—went in there, and when they found that all the best available lands of British Columbia were locked up and they could get no title to them and no assurance that they could obtain one, they turned away and invested their means and became citizens in the great Republic to the south of us. I think it is a great misfortune that these lands have been locked up and one of the many misfortunes that have arisen from their being so locked up is the present difficulty with respect to the terminus. If those lands had been in a position to be occupied there would be no difficulty whatever and no hardships in connection with this terminus question; for all those lands would have been occupied years ago, but this is only another evidence of the evil resulting from a policy of inaction and procrastination. Last session, immediately after the passing of the Monopoly Coal Bill—improperly called the Island Railway Bill, or Settlement Bill—the Premier of British Columbia who was here at the time—I am sorry to think, too, here not advocating the true interests of his province, but sacrificing them and endeavoring to further his own, and particular friend's, private interests, which appeared to be paramount to all other considerations—he was here, and it appears from correspondence, which I

shall presently read, that immediately after the passage of that Bill he opened negotiations with the Government, or came to some understanding with them, by which all the lands west of Port Moody were to be reconveyed to the province. At least such a statement appears in the correspondence which passed between that hon. premier and the vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I fear that it is the fact, although up to the last month I failed to find any proof of it in the Department of the Interior. There was no re-conveyance and they knew nothing at all about it, yet I am afraid from the course which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are pursuing, and the course that the Legislature of British Columbia have been and still are pursuing, that that is really the fact, that those Dominion lands west of Port Moody were promised and will be conveyed to the local Government, and that for nothing—worse than nothing. If such I say is the fact, I consider that the least the Government could have done was to have consulted some member in the popular branch of the Legislature about it, if they thought it not worth their while to consult any member from British Columbia in this House. As far as I am aware, and I think I speak advisedly in the matter, not a member from British Columbia in this House or in the House of Commons was ever consulted about it. The whole affair was manipulated through the Premier of British Columbia, and under such circumstances I would like to know if we have responsible and representative Government? Does the Federal Government owe its existence and support to the Local Legislatures, or does it owe its support to the men who are elected from the different constituencies to come here and represent their views? I say if that is called Representative Government it is a farce, and I am sorry to say that the representatives of British Columbia for a number of years have been entirely ignored. A correspondence was submitted to the Legislature of British Columbia in January last, a copy of which I hold in my hand, and from which I will read a few extracts. The first is a letter from Hon. Wm. Smith, Premier of British Columbia, to Mr. VanHorne, and is as follows:—

VICTORIA, 23rd May, 1884.

To W. C. VAN HORNE, Montreal.

DEAR SIR,—You are aware that the Dominion Government relinquish all claim to that portion of the Railway Reserve in this province lying to the west of Port Moody; and you will doubtless recollect that when I saw you in Montreal you exacted a promise from me that the Provincial Government would refrain from dealing with these lands until your arrival here, which was to have been within a month from that date.

As more than a month has elapsed, and I am led to understand that the time of your coming is stil uncertain, I now write for the purpose of impressing upon your mind the great inconvenience of keeping these lands longer locked up.

I have now, therefore, to request that you will hasten your visit or hold me released from my promise to await your coming.

I beg you will, on receipt of this, wire me what you propose doing in the matter.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) WM. SMITH.

That is the letter I had reference to a moment ago. Now, I have here a reply to that letter. A number of telegrams intervene in regard to the time that Mr. VanHorne would likely arrive in British Columbia. They are not of very great importance, but I have here the reply dated 9th September 1884, a very short time after Mr. VanHorne had paid a visit to British Columbia, and made arrangements with the Local Government and their friends.

{ "THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Office of the Vice-President,

Montreal, Sept. 9th, 1884.

SIR,—

The Directors of this Company have had under careful consideration the quesiion of the lokation of the Pacific Terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they have authorized me to communicate to you their views, as follows:

Inasmuch as a comprehensive plan for a terminus, providing reasonably for the future as well as for the present, will involve a large immediate outlay of money, and as the present available resources of the Company are required for the completion of their undertaking with the Government, they do not see their way clear to the extension of their line of railway beyond Port Moody, and the provision of the necessary docks and other facilities at a new point, unless they can acquire sufficient property, so situated as to be made immediately saleable, for a sufficient amount to recoup the outlay mentioned."

It will be observed that the Vice-President acknowledges that they have those facilities already at Port Moody.

They feel that as the lands west of Port Moody, recently relinquished by the Dominion Government, were originally intended and set apart to aid in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway to English Bay, and as the lands would have been so applied had the Dominion Government fixed upon English Bay instead of Port Moody as the western terminus, all of these lands should, in fairness, be granted to the company in the event of their taking up the work where the Dominion Government has left it and continuing the line to English Bay.

But our directors wish to meet your Government in a liberal spirit, and to ask for no more than they believe to be necessary to cover their outlay within the near future in making their terminus all that it should be in the interest of the country.

Owing to the great depth of water along the shores of Burrard Inlet, and the impracticability of the use of timber in permanent piers and docks, the docks must necessarily be made along the shore, and a water frontage of very considerable extent will be required. The greater part of the available water frontage is in the hands of private parties, and it is doubtful if any material amount can be obtained at anything like a reasonable price.

On the enclosed plan you will find indicated in green tint so much of the lands belonging to your Government as our Directors deem necessary for their purposes.

It may be said that the lands so indicated are the most immediately available; but it should be remembered that it is the Company alone that has to meet an immediate outlay.

The directors, while believing that in the event of an extension of their line the terminal city will be built on the land fronting on English Bay, attach great importance to the Granville tract, where must be located their first dock, their shops, terminal yard, &c; and while desiring in every way to meet the views of your Government, they are unable to see how they can carry out anything like an adequate plan without the whole of this particular tract—in fact they deem it essential.

I may say for your information, that the shops and yards of the Company in Winnipeg occupy about 240 acres, and more ground at that point has already become necessary.

In consideration of the land, as indicated on the plan enclosed herewith, the Company proposes to extend the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Coal Harbor and English Bay by the time the through line is ready for operation, and to establish the terminus of the Railway in the immediate vicinity of Coal Harbor and English Bay, and commence the construction of the necessary workshops and other works, in time to provide the necessary facilities for the opening of traffic on the through line, that is to say, by the early summer of 1886.

The Company further proposes to construct a branch, from some convenient point on the main line to the town of New Westminster, during the year 1886, on the condition that the town of New Westminster shall contribute $75,000 in cash in aid thereof and furnish the necessary right of way and depot grounds.

It will be necessary that the lands be granted to trustees to be appointed by the Company, in order that they may be free from any lien attaching to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) W. C. VanHorne,

Vice-Presdt.

You will see by this that they want to get the 21,000 acres of land conveyed from the Dominion Government to the Local: they want to get possession of that in such a way that it shall not come within the mortgage that was given to the Government on their road last year. They want that free, in order that they may make a few millions out of it, and, in the event of anything occurring to the Company, that they may hold that property independent of the Government lien. There is also another modest request on the part of this company: The small Indian reserve at False Creek, containing about 100 or 150 acres, is also demanded; and the President of the road, in a letter to Mr. Smith, the Premier of British Columbia, wishes him to keep that quiet and secret, as he was negotiating with the Government in order to get it, so that even poor Lo was to be deprived of his birthright by that transaction.

Now I come to another letter dated from the Canadian Pacific Railway Office, Montreal, November 22nd, 1884, to Mr. Smith, Premier of British Columbia. He says in the second last clause of this letter:—

"I have arranged with the Department of Railways to discontinue their proposed work on an engine-house and other terminal buildings at Port Moody, in view of our intention to erect them in the vicinity of Coal Harbor and English Bay."

I will now refer you to what the Railway Department did. Mr. VanHorne states that he has arranged with the Department to have that stopped, and yet on the face of that statement I find in several newspapers here and in British Columbia, that on the 17th February there

was a notice from the Railway Department at Ottawa, signed by A. T. Bradley, as Secretary for the Department of Railways and Canals, calling for tenders for the erection of an engine house at North Bend (about 100 miles back into the interior) and one at Port Moody. This notice, as I said before, appeared on the 17th February. Mr. VanHorne on the 22nd day of November states that he had arranged with the Department of Railways that that work should be discontinued. I would like to know how those two statements or transactions can be reconciled? It appears that only a few tenders, one or two, were received for the erection of those houses, but none of them were accepted. I saw the acting Minister of Railways about it, and a second time tenders were called for on the 1st of May, and they were up on the 24th. These tenders again call for the erection of the engine house at Port Moody and one at North Bend. The contract for the one at North Bend was awarded on the 26th May, and the one at Port Moody has been awarded, but on the condition that the contractors are to build it wherever or whenever, not the Government, but the Pacific Railway Company determine it shall be. I have here the specifications, and the notice calling for tenders for iron piles for Port Moody wharf, and the whole specifications are given. The railway wharf, erected some three or four years ago, of wooden piles at Port Moody is beginning to give way, so that it has to be replaced, and they are going to replace it with iron piles. These tenders were called for in April by the Department of Railways, and I ununderstand that the contract was awarded to an English firm about the middle of May. Now I ask in the face of this, how could the Minister of Justice a few days ago have stated here that the Government were undecided as to whether an engine house would be built at Port Moody or not? I say that I cannot understand this, and I would like to put as favorable a construction upon the matter as possible. The statements of the acting Minister of Railways and the vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway I claim are irreconcilable and I fear that there is something wrong. I do not think it requires much penetration to see that there is something radically wrong, something crooked, something that will not bear investigation—that there is duplicity or chicanery somewhere.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear; lots of it.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—What lands have the Government at Port Moody?

HON. MR. McINNES—I am just coming to that. I will for the information of the House, as coming from a higher authority than my mere statement, read from a speech delivered by the Hon. Mr. Smith, Premier of British Columbia in the Legislature of that Province on the 21st of January last. The report of the speech is as follows:—

Hon. Mr. Smith presented plans showing lands handed over to the railway syndicate at Coal Harbor. He said everyone knew that under the terms of union the province was bound to give twenty miles of country on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Dominion, and that in 1880 an Act had been passed by the legislature conveying to the Dominion Government a forty mile belt of land, from English Bay to the Rocky Mountains.

From that date till sometime last winter it had been held that the land forty miles in width from English Bay eastward was under control of Canada under the Act. During the discussion on the railway resolutions in the Dominion Parliament, the Minister of Railways announced that, in so far as the Government were concerned, the terminus of the road had been located at Port Moody. This announcement was followed by an application on behalf of the land west of that point which has been conveyed to Canada conditionally in 1880. Hon. gentlemen could see for themselves from the correspondence how guarded in his language Sir John Macdonald was when he referred to the matter in his letter of the 10th of April last. He (Mr. Smith) thought there was a significance in that guarded language which it might be well to bear in mind. Sir John Macdonald had verbally told him that the Provincial Government were at liberty to deal with the lands west of Port Moody as they might deem expedient, and the Dominion Government were at the present time quite cognizant of the arrangement between the Provincial Government and the syndicate. It should not be forgotten, however, that it would only require that the Dominion should decide to extend the line to English Bay in order to secure all the land in the Burrard Inlet peninsula and twenty miles on each side thereof, in which event the large revenues

from the sale of the lands now in the local government's hands to deal with would vanish away like thin air.

He is beginning now to boast and to show the House the great value of the lands that he succeeded in getting back from the Dominion Government. He points out that if the Dominion Government extended the road and held the lands themselves, the Dominion treasury would be enriched, while the province would be left out in the cold. The hon. gentleman recounted in detail the interviews and correspondence between Mr. Van Horne and himself, showing that the application came first from the syndicate, and that the Government had simply seized the opportunity which offered, in the most unhoped for way, a chance of securing a large revenue to the province, while at the same time they were aiding the Canadian Pacific syndicate by a grant of land which they themselves would make valuable. There were over twenty thousand acres now in the hands of the province within the Burrard Inlet peninsula, 6,000 of that it was proposed to give to the company on the conditions specified in their correspondence, the remaining 14,000 would be for sale, and would realize such prices that the province would be made comparatively rich for years to come, and be in a position to aid in the opening up and development of the resources of the country, as could be done in no other way and by no other means. We could secure the extension of the railway with all its attendant advantages for only the grant of an area of land not much more than one hundredth part of that which was conveyed to Canada without a murmur in 1880 for exactly the same consideration, and which we would not be compelled to give again in spite of ourselves, if the Dominion Government should choose to change its mind and locate the railway twenty miles further instead of leaving it to be done by the syndicate. The hon. gentleman explained how much the Dominion Government would have to gain in a pecuniary sense if they should do this. He had no doubt but that it was nothing but the feeling —in the face of the $30,000,000 which was being asked from Parliament at the time—that it would be well to say that the government were not incurring any expense for building a single mile of road more than the terms of union required, which induced the Minister of Railways to announce that Port Moody was the terminus, so far as the Government were concerned. Anyone could see that the Dominion Government had relinquished an opportunity to glran a rich harvest of revenue, and if by any chance the arrangement entered into between the provincial government and the syndicate should fall through, there would be a mighty temptation to the Dominion to take the thing in hand and secure all the land, and he was most emphatically of opinion that Sir John's guarded language, before referred to, was simply to leave the the door open for that course to be adopted, if necessary. As the resolution would come up in a few days, he would reserve any further remarks until that occasion.

That is the speech delivered by Mr. Smith, the Premier of British Columbia. Now I will read a very short extract from a speech delivered by the Finance Minister of British Columbia, bearing on the same subject. The paper in which I find the report is the organ of the Provincial Secretary and Finance Minister of British Columbia, and is published by his brother. It is the *British Columbian:*

"The hon. gentleman," that is the Finance Minister, "proceeded to invite attention to the bargain which the House was invited to endorse. In the terms of confederation we had willingly given a grant of 25,000 acres a mile towards the construction of the railway, and an equal area had been given in the case of the Island railway. But what was the country now called upon to contribute towards continuing the great national highway down to its true and final terminus on English Bay? Why, Mr. Speaker, just 6,000 acres, being exactly at the rate of 272 acres a mile for the extension. And this paltry 6,000 acres constituted a portion of the belt Columbia had cheerfully agreed to convey to Canada in constructing the railway down to the English Bay; but it was only six thousand of the half million and more that we had originally agreed to give. Confining consideration to the twenty odd thousand acres held by the Crown on the peninsula between Burrard Inlet and the Fraser River, it would be found that the Government were retaining fully two-thirds. It has been said, in opposition, that the Government were giving the company all the ready valuable land, and only retaining outside lands of comparatively little value; but such was not at all the fact. The land retained by the Government comprised more than two-thirds of the frontage, and the very best of the frontage, on Burrard Inlet and English Bay. Taking as a basis of calculation the actual price received at the sale of Hastings town lots, held before any definite arrangement for extension had been made, it would be found that the three thousand acres fronting on these harbors, retained by the Government, would be worth one million five hundred thousand. It would not be too much to expect that the lands fronting on these great harbors will, once the question is finally settled and the extension and terminal works fairly under way, bring at least twice as much as did the Hastings lots last year; and at that rate three thousand acres of the fourteen thousand reserved by the Government might be expected to yield three millions. He had no hesitation in saying that, with the great railway and ocean scheme carried out successfully, the lands retained by the Government on the peninsula alone would, if properly handled, during the

next four or five years, yield four or five millions of revenue. When it was remembered that these lands would owe their immense value solely to the extension of the railway, he could not see how it was possible for any unprejudiced person to deny that the Government had succeeded in making an exceptionally good bargain—one which would create a source of future revenue that would enable whatever government might be in power to carry on public works for many years to come without increasing taxation or adding to the public debt."

It will be seen, hon. gentlemen, by those statements, making a certain allowance for, perhaps, the excitement of the debate, that there is not a question at all about it, but that those lands handed over by the Dominion (if they have been handed over) would, within one year from now, be worth from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000. But, while those lands would be enhanced in value by the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I ask what would be the condition of affairs at Port Moody? What value would the Dominion property immediately around and in Port Moody possess? Hon. gentlemen may not be aware of the fact, but within five or six miles of Port Moody the Dominion Government own some 18,000 acres of land. If this road is allowed to be extended from Port Moody to English Bay those lands would become, comparatively speaking, valueless. Four or five millions of dollars would be lost to the treasury of the Dominion, which ought to go towards recouping the Government here for thevast expenditure that they have been at in building the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now there is another matter to which I wish to refer, and it is this: when I had the honor of occupying a seat in the other branch of Parliament, representing New Westminster district, in 1879, when those lands, as I said before, were reserved and locked up and could not be dealt with, I feared that some difficulty or disputes or hardships would arise between the squatters and the Government, and I thought that then was the best time to get a definite statement from the Government as to what their policy would be with respect to those squatters. On the 31st March, 1879, I put the following question to the Minister of Railways in the House of Commons: "Whether it is the intention of the Government to give an assurance to all who may settle on the railway reserve lands in British Columbia that they will be allowed to purchase all land occupied or improved by them at whatever prices the Government may set on adjoining unoccupied or unimproved lands."

Sir Charles Tupper speaking for the Government made the following reply:—"When the lands reserved for railway purposes become the property of the Government they will be prepared to consider the equitable claims of squatters." Then he goes on to explain how—"By allowing them to obtain possession at the price of the lands before the improvements, or if the lands are required for railway purposes the Government will pay them the value of the improvements that have been made."

That was all I could expect, in fact it was more than I expected—it was a more liberal policy than I had anticipated the Government would pursue with respect to those lands. I thought if those squatters got the lands at the Government upset price when they came into the market they ought to be well satisfied; but here Sir Charles stated that they would get the lands at the price they were worth when they squatted on them. Now this railway belt extended to English Bay and Coal Harbor, and in the meantime a number of squatters, not only there, but all through the New Westminster and Yale districts—hundreds went there on the strength of the announcement of the Government. How are those squatters west of Port Moody on the lands proposed to be handed over to the local Government to be dealt with—how have they been dealt with? Last year that unpatriotic local Government went to work and ignored their claims entirely. I certainly think it is the bounden duty of the Federal Government, when they had those lands locked up and when those squatters went there in all confidence and good faith to hew out homes for themselves and families, to protect those people. But such is not the case; they have been handed over to the tender mercies of the local Government that I am afraid to characterize.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear; don't be nervous, don't be afraid.

HON. MR. MCINNES—There is another objection, and I consider a very grave

objection, to the extension of the road to English Bay, and that is from a military standpoint. Hon. gentleman may not be aware that, as I read in Sir Charles Tupper's speech of last year, the Admiralty have selected Bidwell Bay, about midway up Burrard Inlet, as the future rendezvous of the British squadron on the Pacific coast. The extension of the road down to English Bay, and the building of a large terminal city there would have this effect—it would leave that city almost wholly exposed to any enemy attacking it by water. With fortifications at the first narrows of Burrard Inlet, I claim that it would be almost impossible for a hostile fleet to gain access to the western part of the Inlet and with fortifications again at the second narrows, the terminus if allowed to remain at Port Moody, where it ought to remain, the natural terminus, I claim would be as impregnable as Gibraltar. There is another objection to extending the line to Coal Harbour. The water supply that would be necessary for a city of any size would be entirely wanting there, and I think that, of itself, is a great consideration in the selection of any terminal city. Now I think I have made it sufficiently plain that seven years ago Port Moody was selected as the terminus. It was selected by a Liberal Government; the selection was endorsed by a Conservative administration, the present Government In the most unmistakable and emphatic language that could be used, it was declared to be the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Relying on the emphatic and solemn statements of the Government, which ought to be and were considered sacred by a great number, unfortunately for themselves—hundreds, yes I believe I am within the mark in saying thousands have gone in and bought largely in and around Port Moody. People from every province in the Dominion have invested large sums of money there on the strength and the faith of the Government announcement—hundreds who never saw Port Moody or the province of British Columbia have invested, some of them, their all in property there. Surely the Government do not think of breaking faith with those people who have been led on year after year to believe that Port Moody was the fixed and indisputable terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway! Again I have shown that by allowing the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Port Moody to English Bay that the Dominion exchequer will be affected to the extent of at least $3,000,000 or $4,000,000.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—In what way?

HON. MR. McINNES—By the depreciation of the lands that the Government own in and about Port Moody. Those lands would become, as I said before, comparatively valueless if the road is extended down to Coal Harbor. They will be depreciated, and the value of the lands that they have so generously handed back to the Local Government will be increased in the same ratio. I ask in all sincerity and earnestness are we prepared to make such a sacrifice—a sacrifice that will benefit only a few avaricious adventurers—I cannot characterize them as anything else than that. The Government will suffer, the country will not be benefited in the slightest degree, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, as a railway, instead of being benefited by the extension will be largely, I believe, handicapped. I believe it has been stated by the Syndicate that they could not get a sufficient quantity of land for terminal purposes at Port Moody. Hon. gentlemen, such is not the case. I give that a most emphatic denial. In December last, rumors to the effect that the proposed engine houses at Port Moody were not to be built, but that the money was to be given to the Syndicate to build them at English Bay, were current in British Columbia. On the 6th December I forwarded this telegram to the acting Minister of Railways:

"Stated here that Railway Department sanctions Syndicate removing proposed terminal buildings from Port Moody to Coal Harbor. Van Horne, when here, announced that all terminal works and private interests at Port Moody would be undisturbed. Surely Government will not sanction or allow syndicate to remove proposed terminal buildings after Tupper's positive declaration of last session. Property owners at Port Moody have offered 400 acres for terminal purposes, and are prepared to give one-third of all private property within one mile of Port Moody. Please communicate this to Syndicate. Answer."

A few days afterwards I received from the acting Minister a reply to the effect that he was perfectly ignorant—perfectly in the dark:

"Know nothing of rumored removal of terminal buildings from Port Moody. Have forwarded your telegram."

HON. MR. WARK—What is the date of that?

HON. MR. McINNES—The 6th December. This is months before they advertised for the building of engine houses. Prior to that these people interested in Port Moody, fearing that there was something wrong and that there would be an attempt to extend the road, made this offer directly to the Syndicate, to Mr. VanHorne, the vice-president, Mr. Stevens the president, being in England at the time, so that for the Syndicate or their friends to say that it is necessary to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway to Coal Harbour, or English Bay, in order to procure a sufficient amount of available land for terminal purposes, is a delusion and a snare. For five miles east of Port Moody there is as fine a stretch of level land as one can wish for. There is not a variation of ten feet in that distance.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—That is a long way off.

HON. MR. McINNES—I say it begins at the head of Port Moody and extends five miles eastward. The land we offered was a mile and three-quarters from Port Moody; we were willing to give 450 acres as a gift, and have this annoyance and uncertainty terminated.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—That offer was subsequent to the bargain made with the local government.

HON. MR. McINNES—No, I say this was made on the 6th December. As early as September last, when Mr. Van Horne was in British Columbia, proposals were made to him on behalf of the people of Port Moody. I have also, I think, shown the House that if this road is extended to English Bay not only will the Dominion lands in and about Port Moody be depreciated and result in a loss of $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 to the Dominion, but I want hon. gentlemen to bear this in mind, that a breakwater will be necessary to make a harbor at English Bay, and the cost of constructing one was estimated by Sir Charles Tupper at $1,000,000, or $2,000,000. Where is this money to come from? Is the Syndicate going to take that money out of its pocket and build a breakwater to make a harbor of an open roadstead? No, the syndicate will come again to the Government and say, "English Bay is the terminus; we want $2,000,000 or $3,000,000,"—it will be more likely to cost $3,000,000 than $1,000,000 or $2,000,000—and the Dominion Government would have no alternative, certainly much less excuse than they have for a great many things that they have done, and they would either give the syndicate that amount of money to build a breakwater to suit their ideas, or go on and construct it as a Government work. Year after year, I have no doubt, the Dominion Government will be called upon to expend large sums of money in keeping that place in anything like a safe condition for shipping. I think that is a matter, and a very important one, for the House and the Government to consider. Notwithstanding all the suspicious circumstances in connection with this terminus transaction at the present time, in the face of the uncontroverted statement which I have made, (and I challenge contradiction) I cannot believe, I refuse to believe, that this or any other Government entrusted with the administration of the affairs of this country would so far forget themselves as to hand over three or four millions of dollars worth of the public domain for the sole benefit of a few insatiable—yes, vultures.

HON. MR. POWER—Which are the vultures?

HON. MR. McINNES—There are quite a number of them.

HON. MR. POWER—The Pacific Railway people, or the British Columbia people?

HON. MR. McKAY—Present company excepted.

HON. MR. MCINNES—I mean the present projectors of this mad policy and unwarrantable scheme. I refuse to believe that the Government will lend themselves to a scheme to deceive and defraud hundreds of their fellow citizens, many of whom assisted in placing the Government where they are—that they will lend themselves to a scheme that would, or at least ought to, banish a private citizen or citizens from all honorable society. I cannot, and I will not, believe it until I have the most unmistakable evidence to the contrary. I shall now call your attention to the last report of the Pacific Railway Company, which gives the items in connection with the proposed $5,000,000 loan. Among the different items given as necessary to complete the Pacific Railway I find the following :—

"For the connection with Coal Harbor and English Bay, shops, buildings, docks, tracks and other facilities at Pacific terminus, $760,000."

Are we justified, hon. gentlemen, in allowing our property—I am speaking now of the Dominion—at Port Moody to be depreciated in value to the extent of three or four millions of dollars? Are we justified, in the face of these facts, in again subsidizing a company to the extent of $760,000 to enable them to depreciate the value of our property? Are we justified in saddling the Dominion of Canada with an additional debt for an unnecessary purpose, and to promote private speculation? This is entirely an outside issue. It is for the benefit of a few, I believe, of the Pacific Railway people. It is for the benefit of a few members of the Local Legislature of British Columbia and their friends, and I ask in all fairness and in all candor, is it not one of the greatest pieces of presumption on record that the Pacific Railway Company should come here and ask the Government of this country to give them a certain sum of money by which to depreciate the value of Dominion property and invest it in a way that is beyond the control and beyond the reach of the lien that was given on this Canadian Pacific Railway property last year? This scheme is wholly and solely in the interest of a few individuals, whereby they expect to make four or five millions of dollars not only out of the 6,000 acres of land that they get from the Government, but out of the lands they squeezed out of private individuals. The agents of the Company last year, for months and months, haggled like a lot of very ordinary land jobbers or sharps with private land holders in and around Coal Bay, to give them one-third of their private property in order to get that road, and I believe that concession was made in and around Coal Harbor and English Bay, and by that means the company got hold of somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,000 acres of private lands. This, and the 6,000 acres from the Government, are to be laid out as a site for a magnificent city, a second San Francisco, or, as some imagine, a second Liverpool—as they claim with very little common sense it will be in a few years. I say it is the bounden duty of the Government to make no such concessions to that or any company. To show the state of feeling that exists in a certain portion of British Columbia I will read to the House an extract from a letter received by me on Saturday last from a responsible gentleman in that province. Writing of this burning question he says :—

"This robbing Port Moody of the terminus is beginning to rouse a spirit of rebellion, and all investors are beginning to show very ugly teeth after being assured so many times by the Government that Port Moody was the terminus, invested their little all in clearing out the wilderness and building a home; then for the Government to turn their back on us and allow a syndicate of land grabbing speculators to extend the line to English Bay. The past history of the syndicate (if report be true) is not of a very reliable or honourable character, therefore not to be depended upon. You may depend upon it that if there should be a change made in the terminus that the consequences will be serious; not only will Government be held for compensation by all investors, but, the promoters of the scheme will run considerable risk—hard to account for what they might do. The question is about up to fever heat, the conflicting reports that are constantly being circulated about are creating such a degree of suspense that it is getting quite unbearable. The present action of the Government in calling and recalling for tenders for round houses at Port Moody and then not having it built, looks like actions of a lot of children playing hide and-go-seek.

It was reported here that they only wanted to find out what it would cost at Port Moody in order to hand the amount to the syndicate to build at Coal Harbour. In that case I would suggest that the Government discharge all Canadian contractors and employ Pig Jobbers in future to find the cost of all such

structures. You would hardly credit the number of people that are constantly coming and going all the time and scarcely any investments for want of confidence."

I would say, in conclusion, that in order to settle this terminal question beyond all doubt, I propose, when the Canadian Pacific Relief Bill comes before us, to move that a clause be added to the Bill to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or any member of the Company, or any other company or individual, extending a railway to Coal Harbor or English Bay for the next ten years. By the addition of such a clause the Government will be in a position to realize three or four millions of dollars on their lands at Port Moody; the loan asked for, if granted, will be applied to a legitimate purpose—the completion of the Pacific Railway, and not to a useless extension of the road to a place utterly unfitted for a terminus. If the Government refuse to add this just and reasonable clause to the Bill, then I claim there is only one other honorable course left for them, and that course is to recoup to every person every dollar that they have invested at Port Moody since 1880.

HON. MR. POWER—I am surprised that there is no expression from the Government on this important question.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—You have not given the Government time. My hon. friend is too anxious to find fault.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Hon. gentlemen——

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg will not give the Government time either.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I feel that, having a personal interest in this matter, I am in the position of a man who is his own lawyer, and consequently, according to the old adage, has a fool for a client; but when we come to this House we commence our duties by solemnly divesting ourselve of all private interest, prejudice and partial affection. Having a large pecuniary interest in the Port Moody question, I am somewhat diffident in saying anything at all on this subject; but what has fallen from my hon. friend in his forcible speech is a matter for serious consideration. I think the Government must believe that Port Moody should remain the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was so declared by the Government of the country, and upon that declaration large numbers of persons have invested their means in property at that point, myself amongst them, believing that the utterances of the present Government, and of the late Government, were sincere, and it is a question whether, if the Government should grant this money and allow the terminal buildings to be constructed at English Bay, it might not be so much lost money, and whether they should be a party to extending the railway beyond Port Moody. I am not myself prepared to say how far the Government should interfere; if they believe they have the power, to prevent the extension of the road to English Bay, where they would have to spend millions in building a harbor and maintaining it, it is a question for consideration whether they should vote money for terminal buildings at English Bay, Port Moody having been determined upon as the terminus of the road. I speak with great diffidence, being interested to the extent of tens of thousands of dollars in lands at Port Moody; but if property is to be depreciated in value, and private interests are to be sacrificed owing to the change in the policy of the company, and the Government sanction anything of the kind, it is a grave matter for consideration how far Parliament should grant any further sum of money to the company which would have that effect. I do not at this moment desire to commit myself on the information we have before us, to interfere with what the Company may consider to be in the interest of the road.

HON. MR. MCINNES—What induced you to invest at Port Moody?

HON. MR. KAULBACH — Relying upon the statement of the Government that Port Moody was to be the terminus of the Pacific Railway, I invested there.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am sorry that my hon. friend, who has made this motion, did not inform me that he

intended to go into a discussion of the whole subject. If he had so informed me I would have endeavored to get some information from the Department of Railways on this subject, and would be in a position to answer him more satisfactorily than I can. I thought he would move simply for the papers and defer the discussion until they came down.

HON. MR. POWER—That would be next year.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—He might have moved earlier for these papers. He had six months to move this address.

HON. MR. McINNES—The reason why I did not move in this matter before was I interviewed every member of the Government and did all I possibly could to settle this question without bringing it up in the House. That is the reason why I put it off to the eleventh hour.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend exercised his own judgment in the matter, and he did quite right. As regards the position of the public in this matter, the arrangement between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was to carry this road across the Continent, and Port Moody was chosen and settled as the terminus on the Pacific coast, and so far as the Government is concerned the aid which they gave to the railway—the mileage allowance and the subsidy—all ceased at Port Moody. The Government, therefore, will carry out their arrangement with the railway company when the railway arrives at Port Moody. The hon. gentleman does not quarrel with us, as I understand, because we go to Port Moody; but he quarrels with us because the railway company go beyond Port Moody, and because that company see fit, on their own account, and with their own money, to carry the road ten or twelve miles further down to English Bay. They may or may not be right in doing so. My hon. friend may have reason in what he says as to the eligibility of Port Moody as the terminus of the railway on that coast. He has described with great accuracy the position of Port Moody, and I myself place great stress on the undoubted fact that the British Admiralty say that they can defend Port Moody thoroughly and completely. No doubt it will be a great point in the future to have ports, or one of the ports, at least, on that coast secure from attacks from outside. I do not know how soon we may have to defend that coast, and we all recognize at once the great importance of having a *point d'appui*, something safe and secure, where Her Majesty's vessels and our own vessels could securely lie, and where, if not the terminus, at all events a large station of the Pacific Railway could be established. Now, whether the other advantages which the hon. gentleman attributes to Port Moody are to be found there or not, I do not know. I was at Port Moody myself, and to my observation it presents a high, precipitous bank to the sea, and is not a convenient place for erecting a large town—that is having a natural easy descent to the sea, affording a slope on which a town could be erected. There is a very precipitous bank, and that would have to be levelled and thrown into the sea, and, as suggested by the engineer who was with me, the land on which the future town would have to be situated, would have to be, if not wholly, the greater part of it certainly, made by filling up the low places from the cliffs.

HON. MR. McINNES—That is the tidal flats; there are five miles beyond that, extending from Port Moody to Pitt River, of fine level land.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, but it is very difficult to get at, and is not a convenient place for building a city. I was struck with that fact myself, in going about the coast and talking with persons as to the advantages of other spots such as Coal Harbor, presenting a level aspect towards the sea, and a convenient site for a town. Whether the Pacific Railway Company are doing right in going lower down to Coal Harbor or English Bay, or whether English Bay is a safe harbor, is a point that I am not able to discuss. If my hon. friend had given notice that he was going into this subject on this motion to-day, I would have endeavored to get such information as I could upon that point. In the meantime all the assertions of the Government have been made in

good faith. I have no doubt that when my hon. friend received his information in December last, the Minister did not know anything of a proposed change in the terminus on the Pacific coast. He was not then informed, I am sure, of any desire on the part of the Pacific Railway Company to go to Coal Harbor.

HON. MR. MCINNES—Why not build the roundhouse at Port Moody?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—When my hon. friend asked me the other day where the roundhouse was to be built, I replied that the roundhouse would be built, but I could not say where—whether at Port Moody or some other point to be selected by the Pacific Railway Company. That is as close an answer as I could give him from the information I had. The reason we did not build the roundhouse at Port Moody is, we were not certain that the terminus would be at Port Moody. If the terminus goes lower down it will be convenient to build the roundhouse lower down; and if it is on property that does not belong to the company, the company will have to make allowance to the Government for it. There is no sense in building a roundhouse at Port Moody now; it is better to wait until we see what the ultimate decision of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be. If the company extend the railway lower down, they will go at their own risk and expense. Whether in the future it may turn out that they have committed themselves to a very bad arrangement, and in consequence of having made a very bad arrangement, they may have to come to the country and ask for more money, is a point I am not able to discuss now. The papers will be brought down, and if the hon. gentleman then sees fit to resume the discussion we shall all be better able to take part in it than we are at present, and I shall be very glad, and I am quite sure I shall be able to state to the House that the Government have endeavored to do and have done their duty in the matter; that they have kept faith in carrying the road to Port Moody, but there is no pledge that the company shall not, at their own cost, extend the road further down—in fact that point never came up for discussion at all until after Mr. Van Horne came to the country. He was over there and examined the ground, and he thought the site offered by Port Moody was too small; that there was no room there for the creation of a large city, and even the accommodation at the docks, although very considerable, and very deep water, was not that kind of accommodation which he thought should be found at the docks of a large city. Then the hon. gentleman from New Westminster suggests that this has all been done for the purpose of speculation in land at Coal Harbor or English Bay. That may be, but I do not think there is any foundation for it, as far as I have heard. There was the same opportunity for the company to speculate at Port Moody. Other gentlemen seem to have speculated there, and I judge from the remarks of the hon. gentleman himself, and from the remarks of my hon. friend from Lunenburg, that they have speculated at Port Moody, and they had not a greater facility for doing so than the Pacific Railway Company, if that company had thought fit to do so. I think they had some other motive in going to Coal Harbor, if they did go there, than the unpleasant one that the hon. gentleman attributes to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

HON. MR. MCINNES—They got a gift of 8,000 acres of land.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—And have they not a right to take a gift of 8,000 acres of land?

HON. MR. MCINNES—But the Government has no right to aid them if it is not a benefit to the country.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This Government had nothing to do with it. The British Columbia Government were quite right to exercise their own judgment in the matter. If they thought it was more desirable in the interest of their own province to get the road down to the sea why should they not grant the company 8,000 acres of land? It seems to me the hon. gentleman only makes out a case of possible error of judgment on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; the extension is not made by the Govern-

ment, but by the company on their own responsibility and with their own money.

HON. MR. POWER—I think the House is under an obligation to the hon. gentleman from British Columbia for the clear way in which he has presented this question. It is one which people on this side of the continent are not, as a rule, familiar with. Speaking for myself, I knew nothing at all about the matter until the hon. gentleman began to speak; and I think he has made the thing so clear that it is quite impossible to misunderstand it, and I am somewhat surprised at the attitude assumed by the Minister of Justice. Amongst other things, the Minister of Justice advised the hon. member from British Columbia that he had better wait until the papers come down to discuss this matter. Inasmuch as the papers are not likely to come down during the present session, or at any rate, as the hon. gentleman from British Columbia is not likely to have an opportunity to discuss the matter again this session, the advice is like the old one to lock the stable door after the steed is stolen; because, if the hon. gentleman is right, by next session the whole matter will have been settled and it will be too late to discuss it. As he said, out of consideration for the Government, and as a political friend of theirs, he has waited until the last moment to call the attention of Parliament to the matter, having failed to get a satisfactory assurance from the Government. I do not think it is as simple a case as the Minister of Justice makes it. In the first place, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in their relations with the people of this country as represented by the Government are not in the position of an ordinary railway company or any ordinary business company. They have received already from the country a very much larger sum than the railway has cost to build. It is to be hoped, although I am sorry to say appearances indicate it is not really the case, that the Government are the masters and the company are the servants; but the declaration of the Minister of Justice taken together with circumstances which have occurred heretofore, goes to show that perhaps the positions ought to be reversed. Now the Government, as I understand the case, selected Port Moody as the British Columbia terminus of the Canada Pacific Railway. They did that after a great many surveys and considerable deliberation. The selection was made in the first instance by the Mackenzie administration; it was confirmed by the present administration; and, unless I am mistaken, their decision was embodied in a statute containing the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is a point of view which I had expected the Minister of Justice would have alluded to. Parliament, by declarations made by responsible ministers and solemn agreements entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and embodied in statutes declaring that such a point should be the terminus of a great public work, pledged the faith of the country to that effect. I think the faith of this country is as much pledged to the people who are interested in Port Moody as it is possible for the faith of the country to be pledged to anything, and that it is the duty of the Government to see that that faith is not broken; and if they allow the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to violate the pledge which the Government have made, the Government are just as guilty as if they had violated it themselves. I do not want to repeat what has been said so well by the hon. gentleman from British Columbia, but he has shown clearly—and that is the point which the Minister of Justice has not referred to at all—that the Dominion Government has given up property which they owned, a very large property, I believe some 20,000 acres—below Port Moody, and which if English Bay or Coal Harbor was to be the terminus would have been of great value to the Dominion Government. The Dominion Government have given that up, and have alienated the property which ought to have brought in money to this country.

HON. MR. MCINNES—If the railway was to be extended it should have been built by the Government, and the Government should have kept the land.

HON. MR. POWER—Yes, the Government should have received any benefit that would accrue from owning that large property. The Government in addition

to giving away that property propose to diminish the value of the property they own at Port Moody. It is not justifiable or right for the Government to say that they will diminish the value of their own property, even though they think it proper to break faith with the people who bought land, believing that the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be fixed at Port Moody. They may call it speculation, but there is nothing improper about it. The Government declare in the most solemn way, that the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway is to be at Port Moody; there is not the slightest reason why men hearing that declaration made should not acquire property there and take their chances of making money out of it. These gentlemen have invested their money in a fair, honest and entirely unobjectionable way; but the scheme of the Local Government of British Columbia, or at any rate the scheme which seems to be proposed by the Canadian Pacific Railway is to make money by speculation which is not of the same character at all. It is one of those things, as Dundreary said, "that no fellow can find out"—how it is that the present Government do not appear to be able to say no to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as to any thing. I do not think there is a single instance where that Company have asked anything which it was in the power of the Government to give and the Government have said no. There is one very striking instance of it in that neighborhood—not a very long way from the western terminus—where the company have been allowed to select a route on which the grades are so steep as to make the road almost valueless for commercial purposes. I cannot understand how the Government, who had, under the statute and under their agreement with the company, the right to reject that route, have allowed the company to adopt it. The hon. gentleman from British Columbia has justice, common sense and logic with him; but I am afraid he will not have the Government with him, because the Canadian Pacific Railway are on the other side.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not understand the assertion that the Government have given up land beyond Port Moody; the Government never owned any there except for military or naval purposes, and those lands they have not given up. If the allegation be that part of the railway belt given to the Government for the purpose of constructing this railway below Port Moody has been given up, the reason of that is that the railway, as far as the Government is concerned, stops at Port Moody, and we have no right to land below Port Moody. When we give no payment or subsidy for the construction of a line below Port Moody we have no right to land west of Port Moody.

HON. MR. POWER—You are lending over $700,000 now to put the works there.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Would they not have that at Port Moody all the same?

HON. MR. McINNES—In reply to the Minister of Justice I would remind the House of the Bill that was passed last year called the Settlement Bill with British Columbia. It was claimed that nearly 1,000,000 acres of land in the railway belt in British Columbia had been alienated by pre-emption and otherwise, and in lieu of that they were to get 3,500,000 acres of land in the Peace River country, on the borders of the North-West Territories. I claim if they were short of land they should have retained that instead of taking it from the Peace River country.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We could not retain it because it is not alongside of the railway. We were to have 20,000 on each side of the railway, and, herefore, when we got to Port Moody he grant stopped.

HON. MR McINNES—As you are all aware, I am not a lawyer, but I have studied up this question, and the hon. gentleman who occupied this seat beside me (Mr. Gowan), who, I am sorry, is not here, gave me his opinion upon it. He had occupied a position on the Bench for some 40 years, and he told me that I was right, and that the Dominion lands began at English Bay, or Coal Harbor, and extended to the eastern boundary of the province, and that that was as much a

part of the land belonging to the Government as the land north and south of Port Moody, or at Kamloops, or anywhere else along the reserve. That is really a very fine technical point for the Minister of Justice to raise, and, I believe, not a very just one.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Oh, it is not technical at all.

HON. MR. McINNES—If not, I ask why did not the Government themselves, knowing the immense value attached to lands west of Port Moody, declare English Bay or Coal Harbor the terminus and build the road to that point?

HON. MR. PLUMB—They had given out the contract already.

HON. MR. McINNES—Was it not within their power to give a contract for another twelve miles from Port Moody to English Bay? No, they are actually throwing away $5,000,000 if that is handed back to the Local Government.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—The reason they did not go beyond Port Moody was because Parliament had prevented them going beyond the first tidal harbor. The members, from the Pacific Coast especially, prevented them going a step beyond that—that is one reason.

HON. MR. McINNES—I should like to ask the hon. gentleman where he can find that? It is the first time that I have heard anything of the kind, and I challenge him to show where the member from New Westminster—and I happened to be the member from New Westminster at the time in the House of Commons—ever took such a view. I never at any moment advanced such an idea and never heard it expressed in the other House or here, that the road should not be extended beyond Port Moody.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—In all the debates there and here the contention was that the road was to cease at the first tidal water of British Columbia. A ferry was talked of to Vancouver Island but it was put aside, and the Government said "we will fulfil our contract by building the road to the first tidal harbor." I have every sympathy with the people who have invested at Port Moody, but I think that their grievance is not with the Government but with the Syndicate. The hon. gentleman has made an eloquent speech, but it is about an issue which had passed long ago. He got his route and the road was fixed as far as the Government could fix it, but the Government could not bind the Syndicate to stop at the terminus they selected. The Syndicate are a commercial company. They look at the terminus forced upon the Government by the British Columbia members, and declare it not fit for commercial purposes because it is too narrow and there are strong tides there. They look round and select the best harbor they can find, and why should the Syndicate go down to English Bay and spend all this money and take all this trouble, unless they think it in their interests?

HON. MR. McINNES—They get 8,000 acres of land for going there.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—It is not worth a dollar an acre now and it is only by the expenditure of their money that they make it valuable. The hon. gentleman says the Government lose the value of those lands by not going to English Harbour, and yet he condemns that place from a military point of view and says that they should not take the terminus there. He is opposed to their going there, and yet he says they lose money by not going there. The two things will not hold water.

HON. MR. SMITH—From whom do they get the 8,000 acres?

HON. MR. MACDONALD—The provincial Government give them 6,000 and private proprietors give them the balance.

HON. MR. SMITH—The Dominion Government have nothing to do with it.

HON. MR. McINNES—The Minister of Justice says the Dominion Government never owned it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No.

HON. MR. McINNES—Why was it kept up as a railway reserve for nine years, then?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Because at that time it was not settled whether the terminus should be at Port Moody or not, but when Port Moody was fixed as the terminus we had no claim to any land below that point, because the road did not go beyond that.

HON. MR. McINNES—I want the Minister of Justice to be prepared to show this House that the Dominion Government did not and could not retain lands west of Port Moody.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—The House will see that the construction of the 12 miles of railway is only following out the same policy that is pursued in the eastern part of the Dominion. Montreal is a good harbor, but railways do not stop there but are pushed further on, and it is the same in the Maritime provinces. Railways are extended beyond good ports. They will go to the extreme jumping off point and so it is in the west; they will not stop at English Bay. If there is a chance to get to Vancouver Island they will go there. Those things cannot be controlled by the Government; commercial people will carry them out. It is not in the hands of the Government at all. I am not against the hon. gentleman; I am in accord with him in many things, and I believe Port Moody to be a good harbor, but the grievance in this case is not against the Government, they having fulfilled their promises. They have gone to Port Moody as they agreed they would do; the grievance is entirely against the Syndicate and the Local Government.

HON. MR. McINNES—The Government had a right to prevent them from going further

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (146) "An Act to amend the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

Bill (28) "An Act to incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company." (Mr. Plumb.)

THE SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

INQUIRY.

HON. MR. POWER rose to call attention to the resolutions adopted by the House of Commons at the sitting of that House held on Wednesday, the first instant, providing amongst other things for a subsidy to a line of railway from Montreal to St. John and Halifax, and enquire of the Government whether they propose to make provisions:—

1. That no portion of the subsidy voted for the said line shall be devoted to bridging the St. Lawrence at or near Montreal, or to constructing any railway between Montreal and Sherbrooke or Lennoxville; and

2. That a road between Fredericton and Salisbury, or some adjacent point on the Intercolonial, shall form a section of the line of railway proposed to be constructed, and that work on the said section shall be prosecuted simultaneously with work on the portion of the said line west of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine.

He said: When I put that notice on the paper I had not seen the resolution providing for the short line as it was ultimately worded. The notice given in the House of Commons by the Minister provided for a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbors of St. John and Halifax, *via* Sherbrooke, Moose Head Lake and Mattawamkeag. It was provided that it was to have a subsidy of so much. Since giving the notice, I find that the resolution as actually adopted provided that the line of railway in question should pass not only through the points already named, but through Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury, N.B. The amendment made in the resolution by the Government, at the instance of some of the Lower Province members, to a certain extent answers the question which I put on the paper. I have also, since putting the notice on the paper, read the debate which took place in the other Chamber. That debate has answered another portion of my inquiry. I do not propose to detain the House long in connection with this matter, although it is of some importance. I think it only right to call attention

once more to the origin of this short line movement. The agitation did not begin here at the capital. It originated in a feeling which was very strong in the Lower Provinces, that they were not receiving any benefit from the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; that while they were sharing in the debt and the taxation which arose from the construction of that road and other undertakings that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company went into, they were receiving no benefit whatever from it; and they thought while this vast expenditure of money was going on it was only equitable that they should get something for themselves. What the people of the cities in the Lower Provinces wished was that the means of communication between St. John and Halifax, the two principal cities of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and Montreal, which they looked upon as the commercial capital of Canada, should be made better than it was. I think the House should bear that in mind; and it is to be regretted that it does not seem to have been remembered by a great many of those who have discussed the question. The object of the Short Line, as described by the then Minister of Railways, when dealing with the matter two years ago, was to give the shortest and best practicable line from Montreal to St. John and Halifax. The feeling amongst the people of the Lower Provinces was that the subsidy which was to be granted was to connect the railways in the neighborhood of Montreal with the railway system of the Lower Provinces. Owing to the unfortunate oversights made by the English commissioners in negotiating the treaties with the United States, a large portion of the State of Maine which ought to belong to Canada does not, and that State has been interposed between the railway system of the Lower Provinces and the railway system in the neighborhood of Montreal; and what was needed was a good and satisfactory connection between the two systems. I do not think that it was ever contemplated when this subsidy was proposed—it certainly was not contemplated by the people who asked for it—that a new railway was to be built all the way from Montreal to a point in the Lower Provinces. The object of the subsidy was to fill up the gaps, and make a connection between the railway system of Montreal and the railway system in the Lower Provinces. For the purpose of effecting this work the subsidy which is now granted is certainly a fairly liberal one. I am disposed to think that perhaps the subsidy which was granted two years ago might have been found sufficient; but there is no doubt that the subsidy proposed to be granted by the measure introduced in the other chamber this year is a liberal one; and I think there will be no difficulty found in getting a company to construct all the road needed to connect the railway system in the neighborhood of Montreal with the railway system in the Lower Provinces in a satisfactory way.

One of the reasons why I put these questions on the paper was that the impression had got abroad amongst people here at Ottawa and elsewhere that a portion of the subsidy which is being granted for the purpose of connecting Montreal with the sea-board was to be used in the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence at Lachine. People are, unfortunately, nowadays more suspicious than is to be desired, but so many things have happened which could not have been expected, that it is not to be wondered at that people have got to be suspicious. However, I am pleased to say that this particular suspicion appears to be unfounded; because the Minister of Public Works, in the other House when this matter was being discussed, in reply to a direct question put to him on this point, said that no portion of the subsidy was to be appropriated for the construction of a bridge at Montreal, so that that portion of my first question has already been answered. Then the second portion I think has been answered, although perhaps not very decidedly, and answered in a way that is not satisfactory. The impression had got abroad that a large portion of this subsidy was to be applied to the construction of a new road from Montreal or some place in the neighborhood of that city to Sherbrooke and Lennoxville. That impression was strengthened by the declarations of the friends of what is known as the Pope line. These declarations were heard early in the Session; and later on in the session when the report of the engineers asked for by a resolution of this House in March was laid on the table,

these suspicious were still further strengthened, because we found that the survey which was marked A on the plan and put first on the chief engineer's report was a survey of a proposed line from a point some few miles from Montreal—from Marieville—to Sherbrooke; and I find on looking at the official report of the proceedings in the other Chamber that the Minister of Public Works in discussing the matter spoke of this as being a portion of the contemplated line. He spoke as though it was intended to build this road from Marieville to Sherbrooke; I do not hesitate to say that that road is unnecessary for the purposes of the Short Line—that there are already two roads to Sherbrooke. The Short Line might be connected with the Grand Trunk Railway at Richmond, or it might be connected with the International road in the State of Maine, and you can go from Montreal to Lennoxville by either of two roads at present; so that that road is unnecessary for the purpose of the Short Line, and it does not open up any new country. In the country that it would go through there are, as I have said already, two lines of railway running from Montreal to Sherbrooke, and two lines of railway crossing the country from north to south, and this road is, therefore, unnecessary in every sense. It appears, from the report of the Engineer, that this road will be a difficult one to construct, and necessarily somewhat expensive. The misfortune is that if the money which parliament is now voting for the Short Line Railway is taken to construct this third and unnecessary road to Sherbrooke and Lennoxville, the probabilities are that the subsidy will not be sufficient to construct the really necessary portion of the line further east; and, in all probability, the provinces of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia will not have the link between Fredericton and Moncton or Salisbury—which would make this short line useful to them, simply because the money will have been spent on the road between Montreal and Sherbrooke. It is not necessary, as I have said, to build this road. There is no difficulty in having freight carried by rail now-a-days—in the existing condition of railway business. Every railroad is perfectly willing to take freight on reasonable rates and is glad to get freight. The Grand Trunk Railway, or the other combination of railways lying between Montreal and Lennoxville will be only too glad to carry freight over their lines at reasonable rates, particularly as there are two roads and competition. If a company has a monopoly of trade, it can be stiff and exorbitant; but where there is competition there is no difficulty at all in getting freight carried at reasonable rates; so, as I have said, this road is unnecessary. What we want, if you are going to build from Richmond, is to begin and spend the money at Richmond; if you are going to build from the end of the International Railway, begin to spend the money there—we do not want to have the money spent between Montreal and these points where there are roads already existing; but I believe the truth is that the real object of the construction of that new road between Montreal and Sherbrooke is not to benefit the Lower Provinces—not to give them better connection than they have with Montreal—but it is for the purpose of placing the Canadian Pacific Railway in a position to compete, at a greater advantage than they can now compete, with the Grand Trunk Railway for the American business.

At six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Before 6 o'clock arrived I had pointed out that any third road between Montreal and Sherbrooke or its neighborhood was unnecessary, and I had begun to say that almost the only object I could see for the construction of this third road was the desire to place the Grand Trunk Railway Company at a disadvantage in its competition for American business with the Canadian Pacific Railway; and I think that when the sitting was suspended I was just about to point out some of the objections to that. I may say in the first place, that, as I suppose most of the members of the House are aware, in a great many of the United States a law forbids the construction of roads under circumstances similar to those which exist in this case.

HON. MR. PLUMB—What are the circumstances?

HON. MR. POWER—If the hon gentleman will have patience I shall try and let him know. There are already roads sufficient to supply the wants of the country, to transport all the freight that is to be transported from Montreal to Lennoxville. There are two roads, which are ample for the business; and in some of the United States, in a case of that kind, a charter for the construction of a third road would not be granted; and in the present instance the Dominion Government is not only asked to allow the building of the road, but to pay for the construction of it. It is a thing that would not be tolerated in any of the United States, where they have paid a good deal of attention to this question of railway interests, and I do not think it should be permitted here.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I dare say the hon. gentleman will point out the State or States he refers to.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman is more familiar with the railway business of the United States than I am, and he can point it out himself.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I daresay I am, and they build under the general law, and build where they like.

HON. MR. POWER—In a great many of the United States there are railway commissioners, whose duty it is amongst other things, when a charter is asked for, to see that the proposed line does not unduly conflict with other chartered roads.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is making a speech on a subject that will come up again to-morrow, when he can be properly answered.

HON. MR. POWER—If the hon. gentleman is not prepared to speak he should not have interrupted me. I simply throw out the suggestion I have made as showing that what is proposed to be done here is objected to in other places; and hon gentlemen must see how unfair it is to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway. Their stock is not a particularly profitable one just now. They are suffering from the serious depression in railway business, and also suffering from the competition of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Their American business is very valuable to them, and it is exceedingly unfair to those stockholders for the Government to enter into competition against them by subsidizing their rivals, or building roads for those rivals. I am no particular friend of the Grand Trunk Railway, but still I cannot help recognizing that something is due to the stockholders of that company. The company did get in former years a great deal from Canada; and when it had the field all to itself it was perhaps a little overbearing, and not considerate in its dealings with the people; still that is the way of all railway companies. There is no doubt that the competing line between Montreal and Toronto has been largely constructed by subsidies voted by Parliament for the the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think it would be very objectionable to continue that process, and to subsidize a road the effect of which would be to place the Grand Trunk Railway Company at a still greater disadvantage in their business. There is one feature about this to which I think the attention of the House ought to be called, and the attention of the Ministry in particular—that is, the probable effect of this course upon the construction of railways in future. It seems to me that the logical consequence of the course which has been adopted recently will be to prevent capitalists in England from investing their money in railway construction in Canada; because no matter how promising the future of a proposed line may be, they will see from the history of the past that immediately after their road is completed the Government may charter another company to build another road between the same points, and not only that, but may subsidize that competing line in such a way as to render their investment a very unprofitable one. I think that is a consideration which should suggest itself to the Government, and is of some consequence to the future of the country. In the present case, a natural result of this policy will be that we shall have, perhaps

before a very distant period, a combination between the two great railway corporations which are now competing with one another; and when that combination is effected it will be a very unfortunate thing for Canada; and I do not think that we should, by weakening one of the competitors, do anything that would bring about at an earlier date that consummation. Competition between railway companies, a fair and reasonable competition, is the best thing for the public; and I do not think that we should do anything that would put an end to it. There is one other little matter as to which I did not ask a question, but as to which I should like to say a very few words. It has been suggested to me by reading the debate which occurred on this Short Line question in the other Chamber. The hon. member for Stanstead in that House intimated—and he spoke with a good deal of authority, as I think he is one of those who look at the matter from the inside—he spoke of the possibility that this road would not be constructed, but that certain other roads between Montreal and the Maine border might be acquired—presumably by purchase.

I gather from the course of the discussion that this money might be used in buying up existing roads. I think it would be very objectionable that the money should be used for that purpose. The roads are there, and at the present time railways are always willing to carry freight at a reasonable rate where they have not a monopoly of the business; and the money that would be spent in the purchase of those roads might be much better expended in constructing new roads on the portion of the proposed line where no railways now exist. In order to show how unfair the proposition to take the public money to purchase the rights of the present owners of those roads would be, I shall call the attention of the House to the position of one of those roads, the International Railway. That is one of the roads which it is currently understood is to be acquired under this legislation. That railway is 81 miles in length. It has received from the Dominion a subsidy at the rate of $3,200 a mile, making altogether $259,200 of Dominion money which has gone into it. That same road has received from the Quebec Government $391,122; and it has received from the county of Compton $225,000—making altogether of public money used in the construction of that railway $875,322. That is, the International Railway has been paid out of the public funds of the country a sum of $10,800 a mile. It must strike the House that it would be an exceedingly unfair thing that the country should be obliged, having paid to the International Railway Company almost enough money to build the road—more than half the price of the road at all events—that we should be called upon again to buy that road or to furnish the money to somebody else to buy it at a considerably higher figure than it cost. I think the unfairness of that must strike every hon. gentleman, and I hope when the measure with respect to this Short Line is being further dealt with, that the Government will see that provision is made that the money which is now being voted shall not be expended either for the purpose of constructing roads in the neighborhood of Montreal or purchasing existing roads. The second part of the question I asked is, whether the Government proposed to make provision that a road between Fredericton and Salisbury, or some adjacent point on the Intercolonial, shall form a section of the line of railway proposed to be constructed, and that work on the said section shall be prosecuted simultaneously with work on the portion of the said line west of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine. The revised resolutions provide for the link, and I am glad to see it indeed because that link is a most important one. It does not matter which route for the Short Line is taken, the link between Fredericton and Salisbury is necessary in order to make the Short Line of any value to Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and part of New Brunswick. The line from Fredericton to Salisbury will run through a fertile country, which is already pretty thickly peopled, and which will afford a considerable local business to the road, and it is a line which can be constructed very cheaply. If the Riviere du Loup or Riviere Ouelle road is subsidized under these same resolutions, that link between Fredericton and Salisbury will give the northern road an additional value, and will give, a competing line with the

southern line which will be of value—more especially to the Lower Provinces. The latter part of this second question asks that a proviso be put in the Short Line measure that work on the said section shall be prosecuted simultaneously with work on the line west of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine. I think that it is necessary, or at least very desirable that some such provision should be inserted in the measure; because the subsidy, while large enough to do the work that is absolutely necessary, may give out if it is applied in the manner in which we have some reason to apprehend that it may be applied—in purchasing or constructing railways in the neighborhood of Montreal. We may find after those roads have been built or purchased, and after the connection has been made with the Bangor and Piscataquis road in Maine, that there is not money enough left to build at the eastern end, and in that case the Provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island would reap no benefit from the expenditure of all this money; and it is only right and just to the people of those provinces that provision should be made that they may not be disappointed. The reason why I lay the more stress on this is that the advocates of this southern route, which has apparently been accepted by the Government, the men who are prominent in the advocacy of the road, seem to attach no value at all to the connection with Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island; their object seems to be to go to St. Andrews or St. John and then not to trouble themselves about going any further. The truth is, I think, that the old Atlantic and North-West Railway Company are really the people who are going to have this subsidy, and their original charter was to build from St. Andrews or thereabout to Montreal, or somewhere in the neighborhood, and bridge the St. Lawrence. I think under those circumstances it is especially the duty of Parliament to see that this link between Fredericton and Salisbury is provided for. I may say that another circumstance which is calculated to make us a little suspicious about this, is, that in addition to those declarations of the friends of the southern line and their antecedents, I find that while this road between Montreal and Sherbrooke, which is not a necessary link of the Short Line at all, has been surveyed and a pretty careful estimate of its cost made, no survey whatever has been made of the road between Fredericton and Salisbury which is an essential link in any short line. I think it is necessary, in order to allay the reasonable fears of the people of the Lower Provinces, that a provision should be put in the Bill that the work should go on on this part of the road simultaneously with the work on the rest of it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am afraid I shall have to ask the hon. gentleman to put his questions again, as I really do not know now the question he requires to have answered, as he says some of them have already been answered.

HON. MR. POWR—I said that the first part of the first question had been answered by the Minister of Public Works in the other House.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Then I do not require to answer that.

HON. MR. POWER—The Minister of Public Works said that none of this subsidy should be devoted to bridging the St. Lawrence at Montreal.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Then that question is answered.

HON. MR. POWER—I think that is the only one of the questions that has been directly answered.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—If the Minister of Justice would allow me I would like to ask the hon. gentleman from Halifax why he specially stipulates that no more lines should be bought or constructed in or about Montreal? Is there any particular reason why, if you can get through by Montreal on a shorter route than any other, you should not do it?

HON. MR. POWER—I stated that the money should not be devoted to purchasing existing lines or building a new line between Montreal and Sherbrooke.

HON. MR. OGILVIE — The hon. gentleman stated, not five minures ago, that no line should be bought in or about Montreal. Am I right?

HON. MR. POWER—Certainly.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think we can go into a discussion of that subject on this question. The question will have to come up when we are dealing with the Bill to appropriate certain moneys for certain railways, and then can be discussed properly. The hon. gentleman from Halifax says that the first part of his question is answered; he now only desires to know whether any portion of this money is to be devoted to constructing any railway between Montreal and Sherbrooke or Lennoxville. The resolutions declare that a certain portion of the money is to be devoted to constructing parts of the line between Montreal and Sherbrooke. Then the other part of the question that a road between Fredericton and Salisbury, or some adjacent point on the Intercolonial Railway, shall form a section of the line of railway to be constructed; I think the hon. gentleman says that has been answered.

HON. MR. POWER—It has not been directly answered.

HON. SIR ALEX. CMPBELL—It is in the resolutions. The answer is that part of this road will be constructed. Then the next question is that work on the said section shall be prosecuted simultaneously with work on the portion of the line west of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine. We cannot say whether it is to be done simultaneously or not; but what the hon. gentleman fears there is really no danger of. He fears that the money that has been granted will be expended in a certain locality, and that will leave none for the locality in the Maritime Provinces. That will not be the case, because the money granted will be appropriated on paper in the proportion that the expense of one mile bears to the proportion constructed, so that if there are 100 miles to be constructed the whole money will be divided into 100 portions, each portion representing what a mile will cost as compared with the whole, and will be so paid, so that there will be no danger that the money will be exhausted in any particular portion of the road, because only the money devoted to each particular mile will be expended on that mile. I take occasion to say, in answering these questions, that it appears to me, with my experience in the House, the time is rapidly arriving when this sort of debate on giving notice and asking questions and so on will have to be limited very much. To-night it appears very inconvenient. The hon. gentleman has asked several questions and occupied more or less time in discussing those questions though he admits that part of them have been answered and part I am answering now, and he knows that there is a bill coming before the House when all those questions must necessarily be discussed again. The hon. gentleman has forestalled, without advantage to the House, a discussion that must take place, and with inconvenience to the best mode of dispatching public business.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—The hon. gentleman from Halifax stated when he commenced to speak that he had placed the notice of motion on the paper before action was taken on the question in the other House, and the remarks of the Minister of Justice scarcely apply to the time which my hon. friend occupied in discussing this question.

HON. MR. POWER—When the hon. gentleman (Sir Alex. Campbell) sat on this side of the House, he looked at things in a very different way. We had then very protracted discussions on such motions; and I do not think that the Government can complain now that very much time is taken up in this House by the Opposition. If the hon. gentleman wants to know why I asked the questions, I may say that I did so in order that when the bill came up I should be able to discuss it more intelligently.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman might have said all he desired to say when the Bill is before us.

HON. MR. POWER—But I wanted to get the information beforehand.

HON. MR. CARVELL—The hon. gentleman from Halifax says that not much time is taken up in discussion by the Opposition in this House. The question naturally suggests itself after that remark, on which side is the hon. gentleman?

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of Bill (144) "An Act to authorize the augmentation of the North-West Mounted Police."

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

TROUBLE IN THE NORTH-WEST EXPENSES BILL.

SECOND READING

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the 2nd reading of Bill (149), "An Act for granting to Her Majesty the sum of $1,700,000, required for defraying certain expenses in connection with the troubles in the North-West Territories."

He said:—I will ask that the Bill be read at length at the table. It is for the purpose of appropriating from the Consolidated Revenue $1,700,000 for the purpose of defraying expenses in connection with the troubles in the North-West. The money has already been expended, and it is for the purpose of authorizing the expenditure up to the 30th June.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read at length at the Table.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Happily the war in the North-West is at an end. At least we may presume so from information received through the public press to-day. We have waged war under difficult circumstances and put down a formidable rebellion, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, not a single document connected with that has been before Parliament—this branch of Parliament at any rate—except some brief dispatches. There is naturally a curiosity to know more than what we obtained in a fragmentary form through the press. I am not aware—of course I cannot be aware—whether any dispatch has been received from the General in command, but if there is, which seems reasonable, the information should be laid before Parliament, particularly when the Government ask for money to pay expenses.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman's remark, I think, is appropriate. Despatches which have been received from the General up to this time have been fragmentary and altogether by telegram; but yesterday a despatch at length describing his operations was received, and that was laid before the other branch of Parliament to-day, and will be printed in the early part of the week, and then will appear a succinct account of what has been done in the North-West since the trouble began. I do not know what more we can lay before Parliament. We have put the House in possession of all telegrams immediately on receipt of them, and, outside of the telegrams, the first official paper that we have received is the one I speak of, and it has been laid before the other branch of Parliament by the Minister of Militia. I might have brought a copy here, but it did not occur to me. However, as it goes before the Printing Committee I suppose we will get it in printed form here almost as soon as if it were laid on the table in manuscript. Perhaps I should have brought a copy of it here, and the House, I hope, will pardon the inadvertence.

SUBSIDIES IN AID OF RAILWAYS (NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES) BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (147), "An Act to authorize the grant of certain subsidies in land for the construction of the railways therein mentioned." He said: This Bill, which is up for the second reading, proposes to grant certain subsidies of land to some railways mentioned therein. Those railways are the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, limited, which it is proposed to subsidize to an extent not exceeding 3,800 acres per mile; the Manitoba

& South-Western Colonization Company to the extent of 6,400 acres per mile; the Manitoba & North-Western Railway Company to the extent of 6,400 acres per mile, and the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Railway and Steamboat Company to the extent of 6,400 acres per mile. My hon. friend who leads the Opposition suggested to me the name of a company which had not been included, and I have made inquiry and informed him privately why it should be omitted. It was the desire of the president of the company that it should not be included for the present; otherwise it would have appeared with the others. These railways are likely to go into operation in the North-West, and they will have a good effect in developing the country there, and I understand the leader of the Opposition favors the policy of granting assistance to such companies. We have done a great deal in building the Canadian Pacific Railway there, but it is desirable that branch lines should also be constructed for the purpose of affording the farmers facilities to get their grain to market, and to develop the country. The railways mentioned in this Bill, with the exception of the one referred to by the leader of the Opposition, and which has been omitted for the reason I have mentioned, are all the lines which are likely to go into operation, and the aid to them, therefore, has been general.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

CONSOLIDATED INSURANCE ACT 1877, MODIFICATION BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (20) "An Act to modify the application of 'The Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877.'" He said: There is a general law on the statute book preventing insurance companies doing business unless they comply with certain conditions, which conditions affect, as a rule, the companies doing business throughout the country. There sprung up, after the statute was passed, certain companies doing business under a peculiar system—a system of assessments on the members only, and analogous, to a great extent, to the Mutual Fire Insurance companies. These companies appear to have been doing a tolerably good business throughout the country, and they were placed under this difficulty, that it would seem they were contravening the law in not complying with the conditions affecting insurance companies of another and a different character, and they have appealed to Parliament to prevent the application of laws to them which were intended to apply to insurance companies at large. This Bill is to enact that those general laws shall not affect insurance companies doing business on the assessment system—a system which binds only those who are insuring in the companies and only to the extent of certain promissory notes which they may give for their own premiums, I believe. It is with reference to such companies that this Bill proposes to legislate, and with reference to them they are allowed to do business in the country by taking out a license under this Bill and by making a certain deposit with the Minister of Finance, by way of security, for the purpose of enabling those who have transactions with them to feel that their policies will be met when death happens. There are some slight modifications and some slight amendments which will be necessary, I think, before the Bill goes through, but these I will propose in Committee. They are not of any consequence, but I think they will facilitate the general scope and object of the Bill. I doubted myself whether the appellation contained in the 9th clause—"Assessment companies"—was sufficiently distinct to point out to those wishing to do business with the company the difference between them and ordinary companies, and the words which occurred to my mind were "limited liability." But I am told by those who know better than I do that "Assessment Company" describes more properly the position of such companies than "limited liability," and that those who do business with them will be as well advised of the character of the policy which they get by the use of the words "assessment system" printed on it, as they would be if the words "limited liability" were used, and that the latter term would not adequately describe the position of such a company, because in addition to the right to assess those who insure

in the companies to the extent of notes given for their premiums there is also liability for a rest, a sum which is collected from time to time, and which remains and constitutes of itself, over and above the liability on the promissory notes, a guarantee for the due performance of their policies. I believe Parliament will be quite ready to exempt these companies from liabilities they have incurred by violating the Insurance Act. Some time ago it became my duty, in the office I held, to take, not legal steps against some of these companies, but to initiate steps for the purpose of taking proceedings against them for violating the law. That was done on complaint made by regular old line companies that they were violating the law. I am sure that Parliament will gladly step in and protect these companies from being proceeded against for what was not an intentional breach of the law. However, in future they will have a position which they had not before. It seems to me it is not desirable, in the general interest, that we should allow these companies to be confounded with the older companies which are doing business on a different and, I must say as far as my judgment goes, a sounder and better system. I do not think we should allow them to be confounded, by any loose legislation, with companies doing what I consider justly a stronger and better business. That is to be avoided by the use of the term "assessment system" engraved on their notes and printed on all their policies. It is hoped that this will accomplish the result aimed at, because it is not to be desired that the strong position held by companies doing business under the general system should be lost by them, or gained by these other companies, for want of legislation which will give the world notice that one company is doing business on one system and the other on another system. In committee I propose to omit some of the paragraphs in one or two clauses, and to add a word or two to others, but as I shall have an opportunity of explaining that when the House is in committee on the Bill, I will not detain hon. gentlemen now by describing the details of the measure.

Hon. Mr. WARK—As the hon. the Minister proposes to amend the Bill, I think it would be very desirable that an amendment should be added referring to a different class of companies—mutual insurance companies, where the managers have no stock and nothing at risk at all. They profess to be got up by benevolent individuals who receive a certain premium and divide all but what is actually necessary for expenses amongst the insured, but many of these companies have been wrecked in the United States two years ago.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—The Bill does not apply to them.

Hon. Mr. WARK—The Act it amends applies to them, and I think it would be very well to guard the public against this class of mutual insurance companies, because they can collect what amount they please and charge very high premiums. They are bound, according to their own arrangements, to divide all again among the assured except what is necessary to constitute a fund to meet expenses and pay salaries, and the assured know nothing about it. I am prepared to show by figures the necessity of something of the kind. What I would suggest is that something should be done to require those mutual insurance companies to make fuller returns, to show the amount they receive annually in the shape of premiums, how much of this goes to meet the necessary liabilities of the company, how much is divided in salaries and how much divided amongst the assured in the shape of dividends. I think the assured ought to know publicly how much and to whom the salaries are paid, otherwise they may expend and set apart as much as they please and the assured know nothing about it, only the dividends they receive one year are much smallar than they are another.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—There may be great force in what my hon. friend says but in this Bill there is the following clause :—

"Neither 'The Consolidated Insurance Act 1877,' nor this Act shall apply to any society or association of persons for fraternal, benevolent, industrial or religious purposes, among which purposes shall be the insurance of the lives of the members thereof exclusively ; or to any association for the purpose of life insurance, formed in connection with such society or organization and exclusively from

its members, and insuring the lives of such members exclusively."

So this Bill will not apply to the companies to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, and it is provided that none of the old Act of 1877 shall apply to them. Therefore, I should think they would gradually run into discredit. Whether it would be better to take them out of that position they would likely have fallen into under this Bill, and undertake to rehabilitate them, is a question. Does not this description include all that my hon. friend means—"Any society or association of persons for fraternal, benevolent, industrial or religious purposes, among which purposes shall be the insurance of the lives of the members thereof exclusively?"

HON. MR. WARK—I suppose it does.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This Bill does not apply to such companies, and it is proposed that the Act of 1877 shall not apply to them. If my hon. friend thinks it wiser to propose anything, we will be able to consider it when the Bill goes before a committee of the whole House. In the meantime I think it is very doubtful whether any such amendment should be made.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Some anxiety has been felt in the province from which I come with respect to the position Parliament may take on this question. In Charlottetown some companies exist which may be termed benevolent societies. Sometimes they are known by singularly grotesque names, but the object in every case, is, I believe, some benevolent purpose, and I take it, from the remarks which have just fallen from the Minister of Justice, that such a society as that shall not come under the operation of this Bill. I hope that is so, because all that the associated companies wish for is simply to be let alone. If they should be brought under the operation of the Bill and made to deposit large sums of their capital, I think it would probably have the effect of destroying them altogether and stopping their operation. There is a wide distinction between companies which are ordinarily known as insurance companies and these more humble and unpretending affairs which are understood to be benevolent associations. The former consist of owners of capital who unite for the purpose of making a profit from their capital; others are parties who, knowing each other, and having confidence in each other, unite together for the purpose of having the benefit of mutual support and assistance in the ordinary business of life and on the death of members. It seems to me these are two distinct objects altogether. The one is a speculation by capitalists, involving the employment of a large amount of capital and a large staff of officials, all of whom are not quite so honest as they might be, and the consequence is that public confidence is shaken in such societies and we have to rely upon the action of Parliament and of the treasury to support our interest. The other is a totally different affair. All the parties interested are known to each other and have confidence in each other, and any unnecessary interference on the part of Parliament is likely to do injury. I know from communications I have received from a member of one of those societies in Charlottetown that such a feeling prevails in their minds. As they have done no harm, and as this Bill cannot possibly do them any good, the better way would be to let them alone.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, AND LIQUOR LICENSE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SENATE AMENDMENTS INSISTED ON.

The order of the day having been called,—

Consideration of Message from the House of Commons relative to the amendments made by the Senate to (Bill 92) Further to amend The Canada Temperance Act, 1878, and The Liquor License Act, 1883;—*vide* "Minutes," page 743.—(The Hon. Sir Alex. Campbell.)

HON. MR. VIDAL said: In glancing over the report of the debates on Thursday I noticed that the hon. member from Toronto, Mr. O'Donohoe, expressed a wish that this matter should be postponed

until Wednesday. Now, I am quite prepared either to meet his view or go on with the Bill, as the House may desire. I have no plan of my own in particular to carry out; I am willing to go on, or postpone the consideration of the amendments. (Go on, go on!) Then I will proceed. The amendments which are now to come under our consideration, made by the House of Commons to those which were made in this House and transmitted to them, I see are seven in number. It will be well for hon. gentlemen, perhaps, to have our minutes before them open at page 743, where the amendments made to our amendments are set forth in order and at full length. Before taking these amendments into consideration I may be permitted perhaps to make some general observations upon them. I think the questions involved in these amendments come before us now under very different circumstances from those existing at the time when we were making them. The House of Commons have given their formal decision upon all the matters submitted to them and that decision is now brought down to us. It is of course in the power of this House to disagree with the amendments which that House has made, but at this period of the session I think it must be admitted on all hands that for this House to do so and to send the Bill back to them is certainly equivalent to throwing out the measure altogether. There can be no reasonable prospect of that House being able to take any action upon it or, if it did take action, of its coming to any different decision from that to which it has already come twice, on the most important and perhaps the only amendment on which this House would care to insist. I think the action which will be taken by this House at this time is really decisive and final on this Bill. If this House is willing to accept the Bill as it comes to us from the House of Commons, then of course there is no difficulty in the way, and the Bill in that case can become law. If, on the other hand the House is not willing to accept the Bill as it comes, or insists upon carrying out its view on any one of the points, then the amendments so earnestly desired and assented to by both branches of Parliament will have to be set aside, because one amendment cannot be carried into effect. Is the House prepared to take the responsibility of thus defeating a Bill which both Houses consider to be necessary because its own opinion on one particular point is not agreed with in the other House? I think it is only fair to put it before you in that light. I do not propose to enter on any discussion of the Bill or to introduce anything which would lead to discussion. I have been looking into the order of procedure in cases similar to this, and I notice Bourinot says:—

"When amendments made by one House to a Bill from the other House are received back, and are under consideration, it is not regular to discuss the Bill itself, or its principle, or the policy of the Government thereon; but the debate must be confined to the amendment. Nor on a motion for disagreeing to an amendment of this kind, is it regular to enter into a general discussion of the principle of the Bill, but all debate should be confined to the amendment and the reasons for the same."

Now, if we can adhere to the rule which is here suggested to us, I think it should not occupy us any very great length of time to dispose of the whole of these amendments. I imagine that as to six of them there will be little or no serious objection; of course I anticipate an objection to the 6th. I have said that the difficulty of our not agreeing to the amendment would probably result in throwing out the Bill, because I see that the practice which is required in matters of this kind necessarily involves a certain amount of delay. The practice of a conference between the two Houses in order to bring about an agreement in matters on which they have disagreed has become obsolete. The permission for it remains on the rules because occasions might arise where it would be desirable to resort to it, but as a matter of fact it has not been resorted to at all in the Dominion Parliament, nor indeed since 1863. On this point Bourinot says:

"The old practice of resorting to a conference, in order to bring about an agreement between the two Houses is now virtually obsolete, though the Commons have still a rule on the subject."

And in glancing at what should be done if this House thought it expedient to have a conference, I find that the provisions are such that it would not be desirable to attempt anything of the kind. For instance, when the delegates of the Houses

meet in conference they have no power whatever to discuss. The commissioners from the House asking the conference simply present the record of what has been done in that House; the others simply receive it, and there is no authority whatever for any discussion or explanation, or anything of the kind.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is a free conference.

HON. MR. VIDAL—No, that comes afterwards. Bourinot says :—

"The report of the managers for the House at whose request the conference has taken place is in substance that they have met the managers for the other House, and have delivered to them the communication, with which they were charged. The report of the managers for the other House is substantially that they have met the managers for the former and that the purpose of the conference was to make a certain communication which they have received, and which they then proceed to lay before the House. The report of the managers is then to be considered, and disposed of by the House to which it was sent, which may take place immediately, or be postponed to a future time. The result will be communicated to the other House by a message. Sometimes a second conference will be necessary when the first has not led to an agreement between the Houses."

On that second conference in the same way no discussion takes place, but on the failure of those two conferences to adjust the difference, a free conference takes place and here the managers are free :—

"To attempt by personal persuasion and argument to effect an arrangement between the two Houses. When a free conference is held business is suspended in both Houses."

I do not think either House would be willing to suspend business at this period of the session :

"The Commons stand the whole time uncovered within the bar at the table. The lords walk uncovered to their seats where they remain sitting and covered during the whole conference."

I merely read this to show that it would be inexpedient to resort to a conference. The matter is accomplished now, as Bourinot shows, by message, the reason being attached explaining why there is a disagreement with reference to any amendment. Taking these amendments then in order, I find it is necessary that each item should be dealt with by a separate resolution. I did desire to put two or three of them together, and I thought it might be conveniently done, but the impropriety and inexpediency of it has been pointed out to me, and I shall therefore present as the first resolution :—

"That this House does not insist on its amendments in the fifth clause of the second proviso of its third amendment to the said Bill."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That, as I understand it, is that spirits shall not be disposed of as this amendment contemplated—on certificate of a License Inspector—but they shall continue to be disposed of on the certificate of two Justices of the Peace?

HON. MR. VIDAL—Yes.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have no objection to that.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. VIDAL moved that this House doth concur in the addition made by the House of Commons to the said 3rd amendment, that addition being to insert words requiring a registry to be kept of all the sales of spirits.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. VIDAL moved that this House doth not insist on its 6th amendment to the said Bill. He said: I might mention that this is to restore the clause struck out of the Bill by this House, imposing a penalty upon physicians who violate the law. It is considered that that provision should be made. It does no harm, and reflects no discredit upon any members of the profession, except those who are really guilty of a violation of the law.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I dare say my hon. friend has treated this matter in a proper and regular way. I propose to deal with it, not as a member of the Government much less on behalf of the Government, but as a member of the Senate. It seems to me that as this House has taken a certain stand upon this matter, that our action should be

upheld or we should abandon it; that if the action of the Senate is to be upheld that we should be ready to give reasons for it, and it seems to me to be proper, as the leader of the House, to take care that the action of the House is properly represented, and to take care, as far as I can, that the reasons which may be given for the action of the Senate are such as will justify it in its own eyes and in the eyes of the public. I think upon the whole that it is better for the House, with reference to the other amendments of this Bill—passing by the ones to which I have assented—to adhere to the course which it resolved upon some few days ago when the Bill was before the House. We then, after much deliberation, and after fair discussion, and with the facts all before us, arrived at certain decisions as to what should be done with reference to these various provisions. With reference to the one immediately under discussion, the House thought that it was not a reasonable thing to make a physician liable to summary proceedings before a Justice of the Peace, and we accordingly struck out the provision which the Bill contained to that end. The Commons re-inserted that, but instead of giving us, as I think we are entitled to have had, some reason showing why and how they thought that provision was unnecessary, they simply assert that the provision is necessary. Whoever drew up that portion of the Message, did not fairly consider the relations of the two Houses, or represented properly the idea which, I think, should govern the parliamentary intercourse between the two Houses. Instead of giving us a reason why the amendment that we have made in that particular was unnecessary, the cause alleged in the paper is the simple one that "the provision is necessary in order to the proper and effective enforcement of the law."

HON. MR. SCOTT—The Commons give as a reason: "Because abuses have arisen in counties in which the Act has been adopted, owing to the absence of a penal clause of this nature."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is simply saying to us that we are wrong, that the provision we thought was unnecessary is necessary. They should have told us why it is necessary. I have prepared a message in which I suggest the reasons why the provision is unnecessary: "That the Senate doth insist on its 6th amendment to the said Bill for the following reasons:—That the reasons adduced in the message from the House of Commons do not show how or why the provision stricken out of the said amendment is necessary in order to the proper and effective enforcement of the law; second, because by law provision already exists for indicting and punishing medical men and others, who give certificates under the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, for other than medicinal purposes, and that it is not expedient that medical men charged with such offences should be tried summarily before Justices of the Peace."

Now I quite agee in this. I do not think it is a fair thing to try medical men summarily for an offence against the Act. The House must bear in mind, and those members who are most in favor of this Act will, if they reflect, admit that there are many occasions when a medical man gives a certificate fairly and properly, for which he might be brought before a magistrate who is so earnest, so to speak—I do not want to use any offensive words—in his belief in the virtues of this Act, and so anxious to enforce it, that a medical man would have but scant justice from him, and I do not want to impose that liability on the medical profession. The Commons propose in addition to exposing medical men to that risk, to expose clergymen to it also. I think that is still more objectionable. I would not on any account agree to that. Is it reasonable or fair that where a clergyman, in the absence of a medical man, gives a certificate that alcohol is necessary, he shall be liable to be proceeded against summarily before a Justic of the Peace who is earnest in his admiration of the law, and very anxious to enforce it? Is it a fair thing to expose a clergyman to that risk? I think not. I certainly would not do it, and neither would I do it as regards medical men. As regards that feature of the Message which comes from the House of Commons I propose that we reply that we insist upon our amendment

for the reasons I have given. I have a general Message in my hand which I propose as a return to the Message which has been sent to us from the House of Commons, but I cannot go through the whole of it with reference to each amendment, but will limit it to the amendment which my hon. friend has moved shall be concurred in, as being the most convenient way of meeting it. I move the amendment which I have read to the House.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I cannot at all agree with the view of the Minister of Justice when he says that an insufficient reason is attached to this amendment sent up to us from the House of Commons. They give as a reason for disagreeing to the 6th amendment, that abuses have arisen in counties in which the Act has been adopted, owing to the absence of a penal clause of this nature, and the provision is necessary in order to the proper and effective enforcement of the law. It is certainly the opinion of able lawyers who have looked into this matter that there is no provision in the Canada Temperance Act for the punishment of a physician who in this way, knowingly and wilfully violates the law. Is it the intention of this honorable House that a person, even if occupying a high position in society should escape from punishment if he knowingly, and wilfully and frequently violates the law? Why should he escape?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is not that he should escape punishment, but that that kind of procedure is unwise and inexpedient, and no reason is assigned for such a provision.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The reason assigned by the House of Commons is sufficient, that abuses of this nature have existed in counties where the Act is in force, and it has been found impossible to impose a penalty. Who does it harm? Over whom are we asked to throw the shield of our protection? Not over the honest upright man who discharges his duties faithfully, but over the man who disregards the law, who may have a prejudice against the law and sets it at defiance.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Who is to be the judge whether he has committed a breach of the law?

HON. MR. VIDAL—I say that it is our bounden duty to enforce the law, and to protect the law, and to impose the penalty no matter how high may be the position in society of that person who violates the law. If it is thought there may be danger in having such cases tried before one magistrate, the clause might be amended by providing that they should be tried before two magistrates; but I do not think that there is any danger. I do not think the offense would be a common one; and where it is committed the case can be safely trusted to a magistrate who will not have any object or any desire to inflict a penalty upon any physician, and if he did so improperly there is an opportunity for an appeal.

HON. MR. POWER—Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to read the provision in the original bill which was struck out.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The original bill stood thus: "and any medical man who "gives such a certificate for any other than "strictly medicinal purposes, shall, for the "first offence, be liable, on summary con- "viction before any one or more justices "of the peace under the Act 32nd and "33rd Vic., chap. 31, to a penalty of $20, "and for the second or any subsequent "offence shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty of $40." I cannot conceive any valid objection to such a clause remaining in the Bill.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The Minister of Justice says that a provision already exists in the law for the punishment of a violation of it by a medical man. I was not aware that such a provision existed, and I should like to have it made clear that there is such a provision.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is no doubt that an offence of this sort under the Act may be committed; there is no doubt there may be an accessory to the offence, and the person who gave the false certificate would be an accessory to the crime, and would be indictable as such.

HON. MR. SCOTT—In drawing up the Act I had not that in view, and I must say that at that time I had a high appreciation of the medical profession and I did not think it was possible, until after the disclosures that came to light in Halton and Prince Edward Island, that there were men in the profession who would stoop so low as to give the certificates that we have read of—certificates ordering four gallons of brandy for one prescription, or 72 bottles of porter, enough to take a bath in. These were the abuses for the repression of which this amendment was considered necessary, and abuses that the Message from the Commons properly points to. If there is no provision in the law to meet such abuses, I say it is time that that provision was made. Medical men should not be protected when they openly violate an Act of Parliament, and do it for mercenary purposes. I am told that in Prince Edward Island some medical men carry about with them certificates for spirituous liquors which they sell at $1 each, wholly irrespective of whether they are required for medicinal purposes or not. It is for this reason the House of Commons introduced this amendment. To-day, as far as my knowledge of the Act goes, it does not reach medical men who violate the law in this way, unless you choose to reach them by a provision of this kind, notwithstanding what has fallen from my hon. friend to the contrary. The hon. gentleman has stated there, as part of the record, that a provision does exist for indicting a medical man who gives a false certificate for spirits. This provision asked for is no stronger than the one he quoted, yet he objects to this because he says no adequate reason is assigned for it. No other reason is necessary than the one the House of Commons has given, that abuses have occurred and that this provision is necessary. I myself illustrated on a former occasion the abuses of the law, giving the names of the parties and the quantities of liquors sold under certificates from medical men.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Will the hon. gentleman give us the name of the medical man in Prince Edward Island who peddle certificates at $1 a piece?

HON. MR. SCOTT—I read the name of the man who ordered four gallons of brandy and 72 bottles of porter as prescriptions.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—The hon. gentleman made a statement that medical men are travelling through Prince Edward Island peddling certificates at $1 a piece, and I ask him for the names?

HON. MR. ROBITAILLE — The hon. gentleman from Ottawa has given us good reasons why we should insist upon not exposing medical men to what may become a persecution. He states here in the presence of learned gentlemen in this House that a medical man is blameable because he thinks proper to give a certificate for four gallons of brandy or 72 bottles of porter to any man for medicinal purposes. It strikes me that it is very easily explained. Take, for instance, a person who has sickness in his family, living in a country place, and it is necessary, in the opinion of the medical attendant that there should be spirits in the house on account of those who are ill there. He gives a certificate for four gallons of brandy for the simple reason that it is a stock to be laid in, may be for months, to be used for medicinal purposes. Then the hon. gentleman must understand that if you order a barrel of bottled porter, that it contains just 72 pint bottles, and therefore I say that a person living at a distance from a city, where such things cannot be procured, should have a certificate from a medical man in order to get a supply that may last for some months. Who is to be the judge that the certificate has been wrongly issued? Would the hon. gentleman himself pretend to say that a medical certificate was wrongfully issued which, in the opinion of the physician himself, is a correct certificate? Who is going to judge the action of the medical man? The first man you meet in the street may come up and accuse the medical man of having wrongfully issued a certificate, and who is to judge him? He will bring him before the first magistrate he finds—perhaps a magistrate whose name was suggested to the authorities for the purpose of the prosecution which is mentioned by this Act. I say you expose honorable men to be brought before a magistrate who interposes himself between the person who re-

ceives the certificate and the man who issued it. He will put his opinion against that of the medical man, and, by authority of this Act, perhaps condemn him unjustly. The physician in such case will be ruined in character and ruined in pocket, and to this risk he would be exposed especially in country places where politics run very high in some sections, and where you find some political party will prosecute a medical man of the opposite party, magistrates will be found who will go to work cheerfully to ruin a professional man's character.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I regret very much that the hon. gentleman from Sarnia and the hon. gentleman from Ottawa should have made up their minds to oppose this amendment, because it does seem to me that there is very good ground in the argument which has been brought forward by the leader of this House for the course which he has taken; and inasmuch as I have myself systematically in these debates supported the action of the gentlemen who are in favor of the Scott Act, I would wish most sincerely to be able to pursue that course throughout. But it seems to me that the policy which the hon. gentlemen have thought proper to adopt in this particular instance is an unreasonable one, and I, as a man who professes to be guided as much as possible by the best judgment I can bring to bear upon a question of this importance, am hindered in consequence from giving them the support upon this motion which I have given them hitherto. It seems to me that a justice of the peace is not a proper tribunal to send a medical man before. It must be pretty well known to members of this House the class from which justices of the peace are generally drawn in a province. They are excellent men, estimable men in their proper sphere in life, as farmers or members of society generally. In our Province, at all events, I may say with perfect knowledge of the fact, it very rarely happens that they act in their judicial capacity, and consequently they have not that readiness and experience in weighing and deciding cases, so essential to the proper administration of justice—particularly in a case of this sort. And further I see an objection to the course which the hon. gentleman from Sarnia and his friends propose on this occasion, that it is reasonable to assume that the informer in this case will carry the information before magistrates who are notoriously in favor of the Temperance Act. The hon. gentleman from Sarnia assumes at once that the man is guilty of the act he is charged with. You may take that man, who is innocent in the eyes of the law until proved guilty, to be tried for his character and position in society before an inexperienced magistrate, or before two magistrates, both of whom are openly and professedly opposed to the very act with which he is charged. They are avowedly members of temperance societies, and strong supporters of the Temperance Act, and that is the tribunal which the hon. gentleman would select, and which he insists upon taking a medical man before to be tried on an information of this sort. These are reasons which have such force in my mind that on this occasion, with great regret I admit, I am obliged to act in a different manner from what I have heretofore done on this important question. I shall, therefore, upon this motion, support the leader of the Government.

The House divided on the amendment, which was carried on the following division:

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Almon,	McKay,
Baillargeon,	McKindsey,
Bolduc,	McMillan,
Boucherville de,	Macdonald,
Campbell, (Sir Alex.),	Montgomery,
Carvell,	Northwood,
Clemow,	O'Donohoe,
DeBlois,	Ogilvie,
Dever,	Paquet,
Dickey,	Read,
Glasier,	Robitaille,
Hamilton,	Smith,
Haythorne,	Sutherland,
Kaulbach,	Thibaudeau,
McDonald,	Trudel.—30.

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Chaffers,	Miller (Speaker),
Chapais,	Power,
Ferrier,	Scott,
Girard,	Stevens,
Leonard,	Vidal,
McInnes,	Wark,—13.
McMaster,	

HON MR. VIDAL—It will be necessary, as a matter of form, that we take action upon the next amendment, though of course it falls to the ground by the amendment which has just carried. I move that this House doth concur in the amendment made by the House of Commons to the words restored to the said Bill in page two, line fifteen.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I move in amendment

That the Senate doth disagree to the further amendment made by the House of Commons to the words stricken out of the Bill by the said sixth amendment, for the following reasons:—

1. For the reasons above given for insisting upon the said sixth amendment

2. Because the said further amendment is not consequent upon the said sixth amendment.

3. Because by the said further amendment Clergymen charged with giving certificates to be used for the purpose of evading the provisions of "*The Canada Temperance Act*, 1878," would be tried summarily before Justices of the Peace, which is even more to be deprecated than that Medical men should be.

The amendment was agreed to on the same division.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I move that this House doth not insist on its 10th amendment to the said Bill to which the Commons disagree. This relates to striking out the forms given in the schedules.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I dissent as strongly from this as from any other of the amendments. It was proposed in the Bill originally that certain forms should be laid down for the guidance of magistrates. Now those forms are misleading, and I have instances which I propose to offer to the House where they are misleading. There are three forms given—8, 9 and 10—which point to a conviction before a magistrate for offences over which the magistrate has no jurisdiction. A magistrate has no jurisdiction over the offence of tampering with a witness; he has no jurisdiction over compromising or compounding a prosecution; he has no jurisdiction over the offence of being party to a compromise, nor are these offences made offences over which a magistrate has jurisdiction by the Act. Nothing could be more misleading than offering to a magistrate a form to do a thing which he has no right to do. I propose that we insist upon our amendments, and that we give these reasons:—

1st. Because the forms given in the schedule to the Bill are vague, loose and misleading.

2nd. Because in certain cases the said forms might lead magistrates to make convictions contrary to law, as, for instance, the forms numbered 8, 9, and 10 respectively in "Schedule C," which relate to indictable offences not punishable on summary conviction.

3rd. Because it is not expedient to make any further departure from the long established and salutary rules of procedure and evidence in criminal cases.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I had nothing to do with the drawing up of those forms and have not compared them with the Act to see whether provision has been made for punishing parties for subornation. I find under clause 100 of the Canada Temperance Act that any person who violates the law is liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty or punishment, and it makes provision for the trial of such offences before certain officials. Has my hon. friend looked carefully into that?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, I have looked into it and had it looked into by one of my own officers.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman may be right. I have not looked into it and cannot pronounce any opinion. On the former point, however, I consider the hon. gentleman is wrong.

The motion was agreed to on the same division.

HON. MR. VIDAL moved that this House doth not insist upon its 11th amendment to the said Bill to which the Commons disagree.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This is the clause which proposed to permit the sale of small beer, light wines and cider. The House of Commons disagree to this amendment for the following reasons:—

"Because it is a violation of the fundamenl tal principles of the Act, which where adopted, prohibits the sale of all intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes; and because the Act has already been adopted in good faith by the Electors in 61 Counties and Cities of the Dominion, believing that under the express provisions of the law it would continue in force unimpaired for three years, and would then only be repealed by the same authority which adopted it; and the passing of the amendment would be a breach of faith on the part of Parliament with the Electors of these Counties and Cities; and further because the amendment is in direct opposition to the wishes of a large portion of the Electors of the Dominion as manifested by the petitions presented to Parliament."

I cannot fancy reasons being given which are less based on knowledge of the constitution and of parliamentary law than these are. They presuppose a sort of compact between Parliament and a certain portion of Her Majesty's subjects who may have voted for the Temperance Act in certain localities and that this compact binds Parliament to those people not to interfere with or alter the law for three years. It is not only incorrect in itself, but it is a violation, it strikes me, of all those principles which are recognized by constitutional lawyers. It rests with Parliament to deal with those things. Even if Parliament had passed a law not to change this Act in any way for three years, it does not bind any other Parliament. We could come here and legislate upon it. It is open for us to do what we think best for the whole country now. We legislate as we please about it and we are not bound by what was done last session or former sessions, and there is nothing in the constitution by which Parliament has entered into a compact not to do anything which might be considered desirable in the public interest, and, besides, this message misrepresents it as the law as it stands. The law as it stands Parliament has not pledged its faith not to interfere for three years with the Act, but it is that the executive shall not interfere for three years unless Parliament desires it to interfere. That is the law, and not what they cite. I propose:—

"That the Senate doth insist upon its eleventh amendment to the said Bill, for the following reasons:—

1. Because the said amendment is desirable in the true interests of temperance.

My hon. friend from Ottawa laughs at that. That is as true, to my mind, as anything can be. I believe honestly and heartily that in the true interests of temperance it is right that people should be allowed to drink wine and cider.

2. Because the reasons adduced in the message from the House of Commons for disagreeing to the said amendment, ignore the constitutional and sovereign authority of Parliament in the making, amending and repealing of laws.

It is laid down there that we cannot do this thing, because we did so and so three years ago. Nothing could be more erroneous, nothing less susceptible of being maintained by any constitutional lawyer.

3. Because there is nothing in "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878," to warrant the Electors of those Cities and Counties in which the second part of the said Act has already been adopted, in believing that it would continue in force unimpaired for three years, the said Act providing only to the effect that no Order-in-Council bringing the second part thereof into force shall be revoked for three years; and the true intent of such provision being, not that the Act should continue for that period unaltered by Parliament, but that the effect of the second part when once adopted should not be impaired by the Executive without the consent of Parliament.

And because, even if the said Act had enacted expressly that the second part thereof when once adopted, should continue in force unaltered for three years, such an enactment would have been subject always to amendment and repeal, inasmuch as no Parliament can bind subsequent Parliaments and because, according to the constitution of the British Empire, and to the law and privileges of Parliament, there is no compact between Parliament and the said electors, nor can there be any breach of faith in the passing of the said amendment.

4. Because the said amendment is in compliance with the wishes of a large number of the Electors of the Dominion as manifested by their petitions presented to Parliament.

Petitions are alleged on one side; petitions exist on the other, and if it is proper for the House to say they refuse to accept this amendment because there are petitions presented in that sense it is quite right for us to say that we adhere to our amendment because there are petitions presented to us in this sense.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I do not propose to discuss with the leader of the House the first proposition whether nations can be made temperate by indulgence in light

wine and beer. I am quite willing to accord to him an honest conviction when he tells us that he believes temperance will be best obtained by permitting the use of those beverages. He has quite as good a right to his opinion as I have to mine. It is one of those cases where, desiring to come to a wise conclusion, we have dissented very widely in the opinions we have formed on that subject. Coming to the next point, where Parliament is breaking faith with those who have adopted the Temperance Act, I dissent directly from his views. There are some constitutional lawyers in the other Chamber, and the opinion there was, on both sides, that in those counties where the Act has been adopted it would be manifestly improper, and retroactive legislation, to disturb the state of things existing in those counties.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am rather disposed to agree that in those counties where the Act has been carried some provision should be made for them.

HON. MR. SCOTT—My hon. friend spoke generally. He made no exception. This Act is rather different from ordinary acts of Parliament. It is a local option act. We pass a law and say to the people "here is a law which you can carry and if it is carried it will be enforced for three years." That is clearly the understanding that it connot be disturbed or repealed for three years. If it cannot be repealed it cannot be changed. Therefore, I say it is not keeping faith with the people when we say to them that what we call light wines and beer shall be sold notwithstanding the Act has been carried. I will not discuss at length, because I would be addressing unwilling ears, why, I consider we are making a great mistake. I only wish to express my regret that the Senate should put on record such an opinion on a question that is so purely one relating to the people. It is a subject matter that we relegated to the people. Parliament said, "We are not going to pass prohibitory laws, but we will allow the people to pass prohibitory laws in various localities. If the temperance education is up to that level, we will permit them to carry it and put the law in force." I say this amendment is a direct breach of faith with the people who carried that law. I think the Senate is making a great mistake, and one which we will regret in future, in placing ourselves so diametrically opposite to the law we have ourselves given the people and on which they have already expressed their opinion. So far as those counties which have not yet carried the Act are concerned I think Parliament can, with ample justice, make any provision it pleases as to what beverages should be admitted under this Act, but so far as those counties are concerned which have already adopted the Act, I say it is a clear breach of faith.

HON. MR. DICKEY—As this is a question affecting the constitutional powers of Parliament the House may indulge me in a few observations on the subject, especially as I agree with what has been said by the hon. member from Ottawa, and at the same time I have been impressed with the remarks of the hon. Minister of Justice. In such a matter as this, above all others, I think the House will be disposed to be led —influenced certainly—but probably they will consider themselves in a position to be led very much by the instruction we get from the Minister of Justice. We have no higher authority in this Parliament and we have very few higher authorities in the land than we have in him, and I am bound to say that on the general question I naturally concur in the constitutional doctrine that he has laid down. I think that when we come to look at those reasons which have been given by the House of Commons if we were to act upon that principle and apply it to all our legislation we should very soon find it entirely a new doctrine which has been unheard of in the history of Parliament. At the same time I have a very strong wish, with regard to this particular application of the doctrine on this amendment, that it should not affect the people who have voted in the different counties. I have that sort of feeling, and if it were in our power, in accordance with the usages of Parliament, to make an amendment to the amendment, which we submitted in another place, I should be disposed to suggest that such a change be made. While I am upon that subject I may say there are a good many gentlemen here who are impressed with the idea that if

we insist upon this amendment it will effectually kill this Bill. Upon that subject, also, I should hesitate to give a vote in favor of the motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, did I suppose it would have that effect, but I am happy to say, in considering the matter and looking at the authorities, I find it cannot have any such effect, because while we cannot make an amendment of our own it is quite open to the House to reconsider their action upon the subject and to make a consequential amendment to this which we now insist upon. I find the doctrine very clearly laid down in Bourinot, and before we come to a vote upon this question I think it is quite right that the House should understand it and that we should not be deterred from giving an opinion on this question by any consideration such as I have expressed myself—that is, that the Act might not go into operation. Bourinot, at page 553, says:—

"If one House agree to the amendments made in a Bill by the other House, a message is returned to that effect, and the Bill is consequently ready to be submitted to the Governor-General. In case the amendments are objected to, a member may propose that the amendments be considered that day three or six months; and when such a motion is agreed to, the Bill is practically defeated for that session. But under ordinary circumstances, when there is a desire to pass the Bill if possible, a member will move that the amendments be disagreed to for certain reasons, which are communicated by message to the other House where the amendments were made. These reasons are moved after the second reading of the amendments. If the Senate or Commons do not adhere to their amendments, on the reasons being communicated to them, they return a message that 'They do not insist, etc., etc,' and no further action need be taken on the subject. But if they 'insist on their amendment,' then the other House will be called upon to consider whether it will continue to disagree or waive its objection in order to save the Bill."

And how that is done is pointed out immediately after on page 554:—

2. Neither House can regularly, at this stage, insert any new provision, or amend, or omit any part of a bill it has passed itself, and sent up to the other House for concurrence. But it is perfectly in order to propose any amendment to an amendment made by the one House to a bill of the other House, provided it is consequential in its nature: that is to say, consequent upon or relevant to the amendment under consideration.

Therefore, when this amendment is insisted upon, as it probably will be, and goes to another place, it will then be for the House there to return a consequential amendment, for example, in the direction I have indicated as regards its operation upon counties that have already passed upon this Act, and in that way a solution of the matter could be arrived at. I am quite sure, from the feeling which has been evinced by the gentlemen to whom I have mentioned the subject, that they will be very much disposed to favorably receive any suggestion like this to get out of the difficulty; because while we insist upon the constitutional doctrine as to the power of Parliament to change the law, still we desire to give every facility to persons situated as those are in counties where the Act has been adopted, to have the benefit of the Act if they desire it, and it can be done in the way I suggest. At the same time I cannot too strongly insist that not only it is a new and most unheard of doctrine, that Parliament not only cannot alter an Act which it has passed, but cannot make a new provision. I have only to refer to the history of this Canada Temperance Act; we have been altering that Act constantly, and the changes affect all counties in which the Act is in operation. Every detail of the Bill before us shows that we have acted on that principle. What was the Liquor License Act of 1883, passed five years after the Canada Temperance Act, but a measure to interfere with the operation of the Canada Temperance Act, and in my own county, in which the Temperance Act was in force, the Liquor Licence Act was also in operation. Nobody, in the discussions on the Liquor License Act of 1883, ever pretended to say that it was unconstitutional, or that we should not make such an enactment because it affected the previous law in force in certain counties throughout the Dominion. I hope I have made those two points clear, first, that I should be willing to give every facility to have this matter reconsidered in another place, which, fortunately, by the usages of Parliament, it can be, and, second, to insist strongly on the right of Parliament to legislate on any matter on which they have legislated before.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I cannot allow this amendment to pass without at least putting on record my views concerning it, and lodging my emphatic and solemn protest in the name of 150,000 electors of this country who have voted for the Act, against the outrage which I insist is being perpetrated upon them. A great deal of argument has been adduced here to prove the fallacy of a statement that has not been made; in the reasons given to us by the House of Commons for disagreeing with this amendment there is no suggestion that Parliament has not power to change the law. No member of the House of Commons would allow such an expression to emanate from that Chamber. I contend that the language used in this message is justified by the circumstances. I assert that this amendment is a violation of the fundamental principle of the Act. Who can dispute that the fundamental principle of the Temperance Act is to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors, without any reference to the quantity of alcohol in them? I hold that the amendment is a distinct and outrageous violation of the principles of that Act. Where in the argument used by the House of Commons do you find anything of the suggestion that Parliament had not the power to amend its laws? There is no such thing. It simply says it would be a breach of faith on the part of Parliament.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear! hear!

HON. MR. VIDAL—Is it not a pure breach of faith on the part of Parliament?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No. What they say is the order-in-council shall not be revoked for three years. It does not say that Parliament may not interfere.

HON. MR. VIDAL—It does not, but it is implied. The very meaning of that Act is that where it is adopted it should not be interfered with for three years.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Not by order-in-council.

HON. MR. VIDAL—It does not matter how. I am speaking in the name of common people, who believe in what Parliament says, that that Act when brought into force can only be revoked by an order-in-council obtained by the same mode of procedure, but the vote cannot be taken within three years. The people have thus the right to expect that the Act shall be kept in force for three years, and it is a violation of an implied compact which Parliament entered into with those who believed that they meant what they said. Therefore, I contend that the House of Commons were perfectly justified in saying that it is a breach of faith on the part of Parliament with those who accepted that Act. The Minister of Justice himself admitted, after his attention was called to the matter by the hon. member from Ottawa, that he thought there might be an exception made in favor of those counties which have adopted the law.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I said I thought they stood in a different position.

HON. MR. VIDAL—But not until the hon. member from Ottawa had called attention to it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It did not occur to me. I thought if some suggestion were made to the other House that they might be disposed to consider it in a different way.

HON. MR. VIDAL— I am quite aware that the hon. gentleman said this, and I was pleased to hear it, and I was also pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Amherst in the same direction, but I hold the reasons given here why that House does not agree to the amendments made by the Senate are valid and cogent reasons and will be appreciated and understood by the people of this country. I am convinced that the legislation we are now passing will not meet with the approbation of the country. We see it indicated by the meetings of the various church courts since we adopted this amendment; they speak clearly and distinctly the sentiments of the people. I say that we are proceeding in direct opposition to the sentiments of the people of this country, sentiments made known to us in a constitutional way by their repre-

sentatives in the other Chamber who have twice voted on this question, once, on the motion of Mr. Gigault, which was voted down, and again when going to them with the express sanction of this House, when it was defeated without a division.

HON. MR. DICKEY—Will my hon. friend state what were the numbers in the first division and the numbers on the second occasion?

HON. MR. VIDAL—I do not remember, but it is of no consequence.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I can give the number.

HON. MR. VIDAL—The hon. gentleman, if he were running an election, would be very glad to be elected by a majority even of two. On this particular amendment there was no division at all, and we have good ground for saying the House of Commons was unanimously opposed to it. The records of that Chamber would justify us in making that statement.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—In the same way the hon. member from Sarnia states that he has the names of 150,000 electors on his petitions here.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I did not say a word to that effect; I said I represented 150,000 people who had voted for the Act.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—Precisely; we have petitions here on our side of the House from a very much larger number of electors.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I am not speaking of petitions, because I know how little importance is attached to petitions in this House, though coming from the most influential bodies in the land, but I claim that I represent the sentiments of 150,000 people who have given their ballots for adopting the Scott Act; that cannot be got over. One hundred and fifty thousand of our electors have thus distinctly expressed themselves in favor of the Act.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—Out of a million.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I hold that we are not meeting the views of the country as a high legislative body when we tamper with a Bill which the people value so highly and which they wish to preserve unimpaired.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I wish to say a word or two on this amendment. My hon. friend who has just sat down, I regret to say, has given us very much the same expression that he gave us on a former occasion. It is very unfortunate that these discussions cannot take place without the use of violent epithets and impugning motives, and without covert threats. As far as this amendment is concerned the question is a perfectly simple one. The House of Commons give us a reason, which we do not think is a proper one, for disagreeing to the amendment. One reason which they give is that we have, as it states, made a compact with the persons who have adopted the Temperance Act, and that it cannot be amended without a breach of faith.

HON. MR. VIDAL—An implied compact.

HON. MR. PLUMB—That language cannot be applied to it. It could not be changed by an Order-in-Council, but Parliament is supreme and can change the Act if it likes. This branch of Parliament has chosen to change it. My hon. friend lays great stress on what he terms the voice of the people who have been heard with regard to this measure. Now although the Act has been adopted in many counties, a fundamental error has been perpetuated in every election that has been held in respect to this Act. I have insisted from the beginning that this Act should only be put in force by a majority of the voters, or it never would have the respect of the people. I say so now, yet in counties which, prior to the last election, had registered voters to the number of over 390,000, this Act has been put in force, and only 123,000 have voted on both sides. Does the hon. gentleman speak of that as being evidence of tremendous enthusiasm on the part of the people? Does he not know that the association of which he is a president, has used every method possible

to bring people to the polls? Does he not know that there is an enthusiastic and zealous organization working for the Act everywhere? He has acknowledged that large sums of money have been spent in carrying those elections, and yet what do we see? The other day an election was held in the county of Middlesex, where there are nearly 90,000 inhabitants, and where there were, in 1882, 20,000 registered voters; how many people voted for and against that Act? Not one-third of the people registered.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B. C.)—By what majority did they carry it?

HON. MR. PLUMB—Two or three thousand. There are about 20,000 voters, of whom only 6,000 went to the polls. I say that is an evidence that the popular will, which we are called upon to respect, has not been expressed in those elections. It is easy to hold meetings and abuse this body as not representing and not being responsible to the people. Why do we not represent the people? Who presumes to say that a body constituted as the Senate is has ever shown that it had not a strong desire to uphold the morals of the community? We honestly differ in opinion from the majority in the other House and we are denounced all over the country in language which certainly is not temperate language—denounced in the most abusive manner. The hon. gentleman says we are standing against the will of the people—that is, against the will of 150,000 out of 1,000,000 voters in this Dominion. I do not deny that 150,000 persons have recorded their votes in favor of the Temperance Act, but the hon. gentleman knows that not long ago there was an election in the county of Perth; the Scott Act did not carry there. The hon. gentleman is very fond of quoting Scripture, and he says one of the strong arguments, perhaps not of himself but of others who uphold the Scott Act, is that we must submit to be punished because of a brother's offence. I will tell the hon. gentleman of another text which can be used: he that is not with me is against me. You cannot ride both sides of that question; those who do not come to the polls we must assume have not an enthusiastic desire to have that Act passed. The argument is used that because they do not go to the polls they approve of the Act; we have as good a right to say—in fact a better right to say—that those who abstain from going to the polls are opposed to the Act. In the county of Hastings the Act was submitted to the people and it was defeated. We have a right to assume that there is a re-action against the proscriptive methods which have been adopted by the hon. gentleman and his friends.

HON. MR. POWER—I rise to a question of order: the hon. gentleman has drifted away from the question before the House.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I am adhering strictly to the propositions which have been made by the House of Commons in sending back this measure, and if the hon. gentleman will read the message he will see that I have done so. It says: "And further, because the amendment is in direct opposition to the wishes of a large portion of the electors of the Dominion as manifested by the petitions presented to Parliament." I have a right, on the other side, to say that I do not think it is in opposition to the wishes of a large majority of the electors of the Dominion. I have a right to go further, and say that I do not believe those petitions presented by the temperance people were signed by electors. There is no proof that they were; we cannot say whether the signers were electors or not. Therefore I say the hon. gentleman's contention that he represents the sentiments of the people is a weak one. From the time that this amendment was passed I have held that it was desirable that the counties which have already adopted the Act should be exempted from the operation of this amendment. Of course it is impossible for the Senate to make any amendment now. I should be very glad if some method could be devised by which we could do so, and I am quite in accord with the hon. member from Ottawa and my hon. friend from Amherst, who have expressed that desire. I trust that in some way or other a satisfactory solution may be arrived at of that difficulty.

The Senate divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division.

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Almon,	McMillan,
Baillargeon,	Macdonald,
Bolduc,	Montgomery,
Boucherville, de,	Nelson,
Campbell (Sir Alex.),	Northwood,
Carvell,	O'Donohoe,
Clemow,	Ogilvie,
DeBlois,	Pâquet,
Dever,	Plumb,
Dickey,	Poirier,
Glasier,	Read,
Hamilton,	Robitaille,
Kaulbach,	Smith,
McDonald,	Sutherland,
McKindsey,	Thibaudeau.—30

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Chaffers,	Miller (Speaker),
Chapais,	Power,
Ferrier,	Scott,
Girard,	Stevens,
Haythorne.	Trudel,
Leonard,	Vidal,
MacInnes,	Wark.—15.
McMaster,	

HON. MR. VIDAL—As a matter of form, it is necessary to take action on the last amendment, although in substance it has been decided. I move that this House doth not insist upon this 12th amendment to the said Bill, to which the Commons disagree.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I move in amendment,

That the Senate doth insist upon its 12th amendment to the said Bill, because it is the consequence of the 10th amendment upon which the Senate doth insist.

The motion in amendment was agreed to on the same division.

HARBOR MASTER AT HALIFAX BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (148), "An Act to amend the Acts respecting the appointment of a Harbor Master at the port of Halifax."

In the Committee,

On the 2nd clause.

HON. MR. POWER—The Minister said, when the Bill was at the 2nd reading that he would ascertain, before we went into committee, how the Harbor Master in St. John was paid, whether it was in exactly the same way as the Harbor Master at Halifax.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I had forgotten. I will ascertain and inform the hon. gentleman at the third reading.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not wish to oppose this measure, but I want to make one remark; if the harbor master has to pay the rent of his office and boat hire out of the $1,800, I do not think he will make much by the change.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is $200 more than he had before.

HON. MR. POWER—But before, I think, he had not to pay those expenses.

THE SPEAKER—Yes, he had to pay them out of a very small salary.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—He paid the expenses out of his salary of $1,600.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not think the salary is excessive.

THE SPEAKER—It is a very inadequate one.

HON. MR. VIDAL, from the Committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, DRUGS AND AGRICULTURAL FERTISIZERS BILL.

COMMONS AMENDMENTS AGREED TO.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the amendments made by the House of Commons to the 26th clause of Bill (W), "An Act respecting the adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilizers," be agreed to. He said: There is only one amendment and it is to this effect, that the penalties, instead of going into the Consolidated Revenue, as the Bill originally provided, shall go to the

municipalities, and in some instances to the private prosecutor.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 10:30 p. m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Tuesday, July 7th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE NORTH-WEST REBELLION.

REPORT SUBMITTED.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island drew attention yesterday to the fact that no official report from the Major-General commanding the field forces in the North-West had been laid on the table of this House. My hon. friend was quite right to draw attention to the fact. To-day I repair the error by laying on the table a copy of the official report from Major-General Middleton, C.B., commanding the North-West field forces, concerning the engagement at Fish Creek on the 24th of April, 1885, Poundmaker's Camp (near Crees' Reserve), 2nd May, 1885, and Batoche, 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th May, 1885.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Bill (103), "An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

TROUBLES IN THE NORTH-WEST EXPENSES BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of Bill (149), "An Act for granting to Her Majesty the sum of $1,700,000, required for defraying certain expenses in connection with the troubles in the North-West Territories."

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

HARBOR MASTER AT HALIFAX BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of Bill (148), "An Act to amend the Acts respecting the appointment of a Harbor Master at the port of Halifax."

He said: I promised I would give my hon. friend from Halifax information respecting the amount of remuneration which the Harbor Master at St. John receives. Although I had a promise from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the information would be here this afternoon, I have not received it, but the third reading of the Bill can be postponed, if necessary, until it is received.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not wish to delay the passage of the Bill, because the information for which I ask would not alter the Bill in any way; it was only information for myself.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (139), "An Act to amend the Act in relation to the Library of Parliament."

In the Committtee,

On the 1st clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The 1st clause provides that there shall be two officers, one of whom, by an unfortunate nomenclature, shall be called the general librarian, and the other the parliamentary librarian. The details of the bill were discussed on the third reading. There will be an addition of one third-class clerk, and the expense of the staff will be increased by $700. I argued on the second reading of the Bill that the additional expenditure is amply justified by

the greater number of members of Parliament, and the increased work in the Library.

HON. MR. POWER—The Minister of Justice thinks that the names chosen for those officers are unfortunate. I think it would be well for the Minister to suggest different names. I am sure the committee will be willing to make the change. It would be a great deal better to leave the names as they are under the existing law, and to say that the assistant librarian shall have special charge of parliamentary work and that his salary shall be larger than the salary of the assistant now is. I have already expressed my view on the subject. I do not think we ought to create this double-headed office when it is not neces sary. Let us appoint, if we will, an assistant librarian with a large salary and with special duties, but let us not have two men with exactly the same powers. It is going to lead to all sorts of trouble and confusion.

HON. MR. ALLAN—Is it really contemplated that the duties assigned to those two officers should be as this sub-section A, in clause 1, would convey to us, that one is to be in point of fact the general librarian, having general charge of the whole library, the general collection of works, and so on, and that the other is to be an officer who might be more strictly called a parliamentary librarian, and whose duties shall be to advise members of both Houses on parliamentary law, etc.? If that is so, I can understand sub-section A and the difference made apparently in the powers of the two officers; but if one is simply the head officer and the other the assistant, I think the subsection is rather misleading.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, I think my hon. friend is not right; there is not to be one head and an assistant. I apprehend there is to be one head to have charge of works relating to parliamentary duties, etc., and law books, and another to have charge of general literature I understand that these two officers will be co-equal in rank and salary. Their duties will be arranged for them and distributed by the joint committee of the two Houses on the Library of Parliament, and they will be under the direction of the two Speakers.

HON. MR. DICKEY—That is not so expressed in the Bill. It gives them equal power and control over the library. I am afraid there will be confusion, and I do not see how it can be avoided.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The confusion will be avoided by the rules which will be laid down by the Library Committee. They have co-ordinate powers but different names. They will receive their directions from the Speakers.

HON. MR. ALLAN—The awkward part of it is the last two lines of subsection A, which provides that they "shall have equal powers as respects the control and management of the library." Now, if both these gentlemen are to act under the direction and control of the Library Committee, then the Library Committee must be the supreme head. Otherwise I do not see how there can be two heads having control over the Library without the two clashing.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The Committee, with the two Speakers, will be the head.

HON. MR. ALLAN—That will never do.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend recollects the system we pursued in the old Parliament at Quebec when we had two librarians; we had Dr. Todd representing the Legislative Assembly and Dr. Adamson representing the Legislative Council.

HON. MR. ALLAN—Were their powers co-equal?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, and their duties were the same and they were at the disposal of members of both Houses. The members of the Legislative Council, being better acquainted with Mr. Adamson, went to him, but not exclusively. I remember often going to Mr. Todd to consult him on matters relating to the practice of Parliament, he being familiar with that subject. I have no doubt other

members did the same thing. The two officers received their directions from the committee on the library and there was no confusion.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN—I was under the impression that one was the Librarian and the other was the Assistant Librarian, and that, therefore, as a matter of fact, the one was to a certain degree subordinate to the other.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—It seems to me difficult to know how a committee of Parliament will control the action of those men if they have co-equal powers given to them.

Hon. Mr. WARK—Was not the old arrangement, spoken of by the Minister of Justice, in consequence of the two branches of the Legislature having each a Library of its own? I saw books the other day marked "Belonging to the Library of the Legislative Council" and in consequence of that I am of the opinion that each branch of the Legislature had its own Librarian.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—At the time of which I speak the Libraries were all together, and there were two Librarians. There may have been a time before the Union when each of the Legislatures had a library of its own, and after the Union the Legislative Council had a librarian, and the Lower House had their librarian.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The Committee will remember that when we discussed this matter in the House a day or two ago, the line of argument adopted by the hon. gentleman was that there were two official languages, and that one of those officers would be consulted in connection with the English works in the library; that the ordering of English works and the finding of English works for persons who wished to consult them would be amongst his duties; and that the other officer would have the selection of French works, and would have charge of that Department of the Library. I do not gather from the explanation of the Minister of Justice that that is the intention now. The Minister says that one of those gentlemen will have charge of the Parliamentary and constitutional Law Library, and the other will have charge of the general business of the Library in other department. I can see no objection to that, because it strikes me that the duty of selecting the English works for the library would be more properly and naturally discharged by the English librarian, and the duty of selecting French works, no matter in what department of literature or science, would be more properly in the hands of the French librarian. Now the Minister gives us to understand that that is not to be the case. I think that the proper course for the Government to take, having left Mr. Decelles to act as librarian for more than a year—whatever they might have done if they had moved immediately after Mr. Todd's death—was to have appointed him librarian, and then to have appointed any gentleman they pleased as assistant librarian with special duties if they chose, and with a larger salary than his predecessor had. As the hon. gentleman from York has said, I cannot see how the business can be satisfactorily transacted under two heads; and with respect to the work done by the Joint Committee of Parliament I shall call the attention of the Minister to this fact, that those two officers are just about taking office now when Parliament is about to be prorogued, and for the whole of the recess, which will probably last six months, those gentlemen will be acting without any rule whatever to guide them.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—They will settle down to their duties.

Hon. Mr. POWER—That is always the way with the Ministry. let the future take care of itself, and then when they get into difficulties Parliament will be asked to come to the rescue.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE—I expressed my views on this matter on the second reading of the Bill, and I have since seen no reason for changing them. One great objection to this proposition is that when once we have established this course of proceeding, if it does not answer the expectations of those who propose it, it will not be very easy to recall it. If you appoint those two gentlemen you appoint

them for life, or during good behavior, and it will be very hard to repeal this Act and get rid of this arrangement once it is fairly established. That is one very great objection to it. I do not myself recollect having heard of an instance where a great national or public library was managed under two co-ordinate heads. The only instance I have heard of is the one referred to by the Minister of Justice, and we have very little information respecting it beyond the fact that such was the case.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It worked very well.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I hope this may work well, but I do not think we can fairly expect that it will. The ordinary principle of management, which is carried out in the everyday affairs of life, is against the probabilities that it will answer. I deeply regret myself that this is done, because we naturally take great pride in that library, and in seeing it progressing in utility and magnitude every year; and of course that success which we are so proud of depends very largely upon the management. I consider that it will be next to a miracle if those two gentlemen conduct the affairs of the Library in a harmonious manner.

HON. MR. ALLAN—In justification of what I said just now I wish to refer to the Act which this Bill amends, and which is chapter 21 of 34 Vic., in which the officers of the Parliamentary Library, it is stated, shall consist of a librarian, assistant librarian and so on. Then it says that their duties shall be such as shall be agreed on by the Speakers of the two Houses, and concurred in by the Joint Committee on the Library. In the schedule where the salaries are put down, the salary of the librarian is stated at $2,500, while that of the assistant librarian is $1,800, which, I think, is a very strong proof that the assistant was not exactly on the same footing as the librarian.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That law still remains in force, and that portion of the statute which relates to the mode in which the duties are to be discharged, is only altered by the co-equal authority given by this Bill, while the right of the Committee on the Library of Parliament to make the rules remains in force.

HON. MR. POWER—It is clear that when the Act of 1871 was passed, the Government were of the opinion that the double-headed system was not as good as the other.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—If you have one officer the Librarian, and the other assistant Librarian, the latter must be considered as holding a subordinate position, and this mode of appointing librarians is consulting the good feelings of both races, which I think is a very desirable thing to do.

The clause was agreed to.

HON. MR. SCOTT—What particular department of the Government has charge of the appointments to the library, and promotions?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think any particular department of the Government has it. The suggestion, I think, generally emanates from the Premier, and is mentioned by him in Council, and discussed there.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I notice at present that there is a gentleman acting as clerk in the library, who is not on the staff—he does not appear in the estimates as being on the staff.

THE SPEAKER—He has been put on the staff.

HON. MR. GIRARD, from the Committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

The bill was then read the third time and passed.

THE LIQUOR LICENSE ACT BILL

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (134) "An Act respecting the Liquor License Act, 1883." He said: Certain portions of the Act

referred to have been declared to be *ultra vires* by the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. By the original Act it was provided that any of the parties concerned, the Dominion or any of the provinces, might, if they saw fit, appeal to the Privy Council in any event, no matter what the decision of the Supreme Court might be. From that decision an appeal has been taken by the Dominion, and the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, and I think New Brunswick, have joined against it. That appeal has been set down for argument in November next. We tried to get it set down for argument in July, and the Attorney General of Ontario was anxious that it should be argued in July; but the ultimate fixing of the time for the argument, which rests with some of the officers of the Privy Council of Her Majesty, was for November, and we may look for a decision of the question between then and the next session of Parliament. Even had the argument taken place in July, we should not have had a decision before the long vacation. The decision of the Privy Council is referred to in the schedule attached to the Bill, together with the questions and the story of the hearing and the name of the judge who dissented from the opinion of the Court, and who thought that the whole Act was *ultra vires.*

HON. MR. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman has referred to certain portions of the Act as being in the doubtful category of *ultra vires.* My recollection of the Act is that it embraces 147 clauses, and that all except three of the clauses, which profess to supplement the Temperance Act of 1878, are embraced in the portions decided as being *ultra vires.* This Act has been a confusing Act from the time it was put on the Statute book. The Government were warned at the time that their Act was *ultra vires*; still they persevered, and made a vast amount of confusion throughout the country by issuing licenses under it. I think that it was due to Parliament that the Government, in suspending the Act at all, should have suspended the whole of it, because it does seem absurd that the ceremony of appointing a board of commissioners, and a number of persons named as Government officials all over the Dominion simply to look after three or four clauses of a Statute consisting of 147 clauses, should have been entered upon; and it would have been much more in keeping with the dignity of the Government if they had suspended the whole Act until the final adjudication had been arrived at. We should not have had this absurdity, a Government Board of Commissioners which had nothing to do except to embarass and confuse still further the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act—because that undoubtedly is their mission, and nothing else, simply to embarass that Act and bring it into discredit, and create confusion. Presumably the appointment of the Board was to carry out the decision of Parliament in issuing licenses under the Act.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I would like to ask the hon. gentleman by what authority the Government were warned that this Act was *ultra vires?*

HON. MR. SCOTT—I, on several occasions, was one of the authorities myself; and a number of gentlemen in the House of Commons gave the Government warning—every gentleman that looked into the question gave the Government warning. This question came up in 1883 in the Speech from the Throne; if the hon. gentleman will consult the record of that date he will find what my views were then; that the Government were assuming to act in this matter of license over which they had no possible control, and I called attention to the indignity that was offered to the Representative of the Queen in making this announcement that the Parliament of the Dominion was to look after the licensing of the public houses all over the country.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman's opinion is not conclusive, and when he says that the Government were warned, and that he was one of those who warned them, it is assuming a rather high and lofty position, and speaking from a standpoint higher than any of our people occupy. He warned us! The hon. gentleman says that the whole of the Act should be suspended. In his ardor for his Temperance Act he speaks as if all who attempted to lay their hands on it

were anathema maranatha. If we suspend the whole Act, who then could deal with licenses for the sale of liquor on board steamers and other vessels? If we suspend the Act who could deal with wholesale licenses? It is necessary that wholesale licenses should be issued, and without this provision in the Act, of which the hon. gentleman complains, restricting the operation of the License Act to those parts declared to be *ultra vires*, there would be no authority to deal with wholesale licenses, and they could not be obtained in any part of the Dominion. That, the hon. gentleman does not want, but if we do not adopt this measure no licenses could be issued on steamers, and no wholesale licenses could be issued throughout the Dominion.

HON. MR. SCOTT—You had the authority before.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We had not the authority before, and the Supreme Court have declared that we have it under this Act. That is their decision, and one is bound by the law. The Supreme Court has decided that the administration, as regards these two subjects of wholesale licenses and licenses to vend liquor on board steamers, must be governed by legislation passed by this Parliament.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Nobody doubted it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman said we should suspend the whole Act. If we did that we would suspend the power to deal with those two things, and if we did so there would be no power in the Dominion to deal with those two things. We would be all at sea again. Therefore, I ask is it not the true logical and legal way to suspend the Act only in so far as the court decided it was illegal, and maintain the Act so far as the court declared it was legal. The language is as plain as possible. It was only the hon. gentleman's ardor for the temperance cause and his unwillingness to sanction anything and everything which did not meet his peculiar views, that led him to object to the Bill.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Had the Bill which was before us yesterday passed into law there would be no necessity for me to refer to a point to which I now wish to invite the Minister's attention. The 145th section of the License Act of 1883 is one of the sections pronounced by the Supreme Court to be *intra vires* and will therefore remain in force. By the decision of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick that 145th section repeals all the sections of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, relating to procedure against, and the convicting and punishing offenders. We will then be in this anomalous position, presuming the Supreme Court of New Brunswick is correct in its judgment, that there will be the keeping in force of a part of the law which requires action to be taken under another part of the law which is to be suspended. What entire and utter confusion this will make! The necessity for meeting this difficulty was recognized at an early period in the session in the other House and a short Bill was introduced for the special purpose of meeting it by simply repealing the 145th section of the License Act. When the Bill amending the Temperance Act was adopted by that House one of its clauses repealed this 145th section, and therefore the hon. gentleman who had charge of this short Bill allowed it to drop because the other measure accomplished what he had in view. I think it is probable that the Bill amending the Canada Temperance Act will fall to the ground. We have no more reason to suppose that the House of Commons will recede from their amendments any more than that the Senate will recede from theirs, so it is likely that the Bill will not be passed. In view of that, I would respectfully ask the Minister of Justice whether it would not be desirable to recognize this difficulty, and when the House is in committee either to repeal that section or to make some other provision to avoid the anomaly of declaring that clause in force, when it depends on a suspended portion of the Bill for its operation. I venture respectfully to call attention to it, and I trust that some way will be found to meet the difficulty.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think my hon. friend is premature in anticipating

the action of the other House. He may be prophetic in some cases but not in this, and until we know what is the determination of the other branch of Parliament it would be unwise to take any action in the direction suggested.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Does the hon. gentleman suggest that we should let this Bill stand until we know the fate of the Bill in the other House?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It makes provision which would be sufficient if the law is as the Supreme Court declares it to be in that respect, but there has been a decision in the Supreme Court of New Brunswick which goes in the other direction, and it was to cure the evils resulting from that decision that the short Bill was introduced in the other branch of Parliament. All I can say is that those gentlemen who take an interest in the subject would have been better advised if they had adhered to that Bill, and presented it to us for the purpose of curing an evil which became apparent from the decision of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. The Bill is complete in that respect that the part of the law which relates to putting in force the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act was saved by the decision of the Supreme Court. It saved the question of vessel licenses and wholesale licenses, and also that portion of the Act relating to the carrying into effect the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878. So that the provisions of the Bill are complete as far as they go. Whether the suggestion of my hon. friend from Sarnia should be followed or not, the subject deserves consideration, and I will endeavor to give it consideration ; but I cannot say what course we will pursue.

HON. MR. POWER—One most desirable quality of legislation is that it should be easily understood. I do not think this Bill has that quality. What I mean is, that a Bill should not take a very superior lawyer to understand it. Laws are put on the statute books so that magistrates and other people of only ordinary legal attainments shall be able to understand them. Now, as this Bill stands, if it goes into the hands of the average man, what does it tell him? It tells him that certain portions of the Liquor License Act of 1883 and the Act amending it are *ultra vires*, and that the portions which are *ultra vires* are suspended. The decision of the Supreme Court tells him that much. It seems to me it would be better if Parliament had defined the portions which are *ultra vires* and not left it to the unfortunate who had to deal with the Bill to find out for himself what portions were covered by the decision of the Supreme Court. Surely the officers in the Department of Justice or the law officers of the House of Commons, or whoever prepared the Bill, should have indicated particularly the portions of those previous Acts that were suspended. I think, perhaps, even the hon. gentleman from Sarnia, who is familiar with legislation, would find it a little difficult to know just how much of the Liquor License Act was suspended and how much was not ; and I appeal to the Minister of Justice himself to say if he does not think, in view of the fact that this Bill when it becomes law will be intended for the guidance of people who are not familiar with law, that it would have been better to define the portions of the Act that are suspended.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—I must say I think the hon. gentleman is hypercritical. The Bill consists of the enacting clause and seven lines. It simply declares that—

> The operation of such portions of "*The Liquor License Act*, 1883," and of the "*Act to amend* '*The Liquor License Act*, 1883,'" as the Supreme Court of Canada has declared by its decision, whereof a copy is in the Schedule to this Act annexed, to be *ultra vires*, is and shall be suspended unless and until the same shall be decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to be *intra vires* of the Parliament of Canada.

Then the judgment follows, and it says that—

> The Acts referred to in the said case namely "The Liquor License Act, 1883," and "An Act to amend the Liquor License Act, 1883," are and each of them is *ultra vires* of the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, except in so far as the said Acts respectively purport to legislate respecting those licenses mentioned in section seven of the said "The Liquor License Act, 1883," which are there denominated vessel licenses and wholesale licenses, and except also in so

far as the Acts respectively relate to the carrying into effect of the provisions of "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."

This Bill suspends all which are *ultra vires*. I do not see how it could be made plainer. It would puzzle anyone to write the thing in more simple language, or to express it more clearly or logically. Whatever the Supreme Court has decided to be *ultra vires* is suspended, and what the Supreme Court declares not to be *ultra vires* is stated in the few words in the judgment of the Supreme Court.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us whether clauses 83 and 84 of the Liquor License Act are suspended?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Then what is the meaning of clause 145, which declares that certain things shall be a contravention of sections 83 and 84 which are suspended? You are keeping in force one clause which relies entirely for its operation on two other clauses, which clauses are suspended, and I do not think any court can make anything out of it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That very fact shows how much better it was to say that the clauses which the Court declared *ultra vires* are suspended, because if you went further you would get into a labyrinth. This Bill says that those clauses which are declared to be *ultra vires* are suspended. That is a clear landmark which will guide anyone who wishes to understand the law

HON. MR. SCOTT—If that was an entire clause by itself, then it would be operative, but to make the 145th clause operative at all, you have got to bring into operation two clauses which are suspended; the basis of it is gone, and that is where the embarrassment is. If the 145th clause were altered in its phraseology so as to be independent of the other two clauses, it could be understood. The simple and proper way would have been to suspend all the clauses in which the Canada Temperance Act is imported, inasmuch as you cannot make sense of the clauses which are left relating to that Act, because you are repealing some clauses which are clearly *ultra vires* of the decision of the Supreme Court on which clauses depend, for its meaning, clause 145 which is preserved.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It only shows that this is the safest way of doing it.

HON. MR. POWER—You throw the onus of interpreting it on the unfortunates who have to read it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is nothing to interpret.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time.

HARBOR COMMISSIONERS OF THREE RIVERS BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (150) "An Act to authorize the advance of a certain sum to the harbor commissioners of Three Rivers."

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS, NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (147) "An Act to authorize the grant of certain subsidies in land for the construction of the railways therein mentioned."

In the committee,

HON. MR. SCOTT—I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman made an explanation with reference to another railway which I thought ought to have been included in this Bill. I understand that my hon. friend said it was omitted because the promoter of this Bill in the other chamber did not desire to press it at the present time. However, there seems some misunderstanding on the subject, because it was his desire that it should

be included. I would like to give further information on the subject. The company was incorporated in 1880 and was allotted a land grant of 6,400 acres of land per mile. When it was announced in the Speech from the Throne that that land grant was to be made free, it gave a stimulus to that enterprise, which was an important one, connecting the Canadian Pacific Railway with Battleford. I have always maintained that the more railways you can have in that country the better. I should like to hear that an Order-in-Council will be brought down and approved of, giving this company the same advantage as the others which are mentioned in the Bill, because if it is left over for another year there is danger that it will drop out. Some $75,000 has been expended on the line already and it seemed to the promoters of the railway that it should not be left behind.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I should be glad to assist in any way to bring the North-West Central Railway back into the position which the roads mentioned in this Bill occupy. As I understood, the chief promoter of that Bill said that he did not want the matter pressed at present.

HON. MR. SCOTT—That is a misunderstanding, I am told.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Well it is very unfortunate. I asked about it on Friday or Saturday, and I was then told by the acting Minister of the Interior, Mr. McLelan, that he had been asked to delay action with reference to that North-West Central Railway, and in consequence had delayed it so that it does not appear in this list. That understanding, which he certainly had on Friday, my hon. friend thinks was removed by some intimation which he got from the promoter of the Bill on Saturday. If he did get that information—I do not at all gainsay it but I have not heard it—it was too late apparently to insert that railway in this Bill. I will confer with the acting Minister of the Interior and see what can be done. We could not insert it in the Bill here, as my hon. friend knows. I am afraid the only way to remedy the omission would be to bring in a new Act. Whether the Government would be prepared to do that I do not know. It is certainly unfortunate that the misunderstanding occurred. What I promised to do I did: I laid it before the Minister of the Interior and asked him why that Company was not included. He raised no objection to it except that its terminus on the Canadian Pacific Railway should be at some point west of the place mentioned, and that difficulty being got over, he approved of it being added in the same way as the others. An Order-in-Council might perhaps facilitate the Company in their transactions. Such an Order-in-Council once procured, would perhaps be sufficient until another session of Parliament. My hon. friend shakes his head: well it may be possible to have a Bill brought in specially with reference to that railway during the present session. I will inquire and if we can do anything about it, I shall be very happy to meet my hon. friend's views.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Parliament had fixed the point of departure at Melbourne and the Order-in-Council recognized that under their public charter they were entitled to land from Melbourne: but it appears in giving land to the Manitoba & North-West Central Railway Company it was found that they were intruding on their territory, that there was not territory enough in the angle between the Canadian Pacific Railway territory and that claimed by the Manitoba & North-Western. As Parliament had given this authority for the point of departure from the Canadian Pacific Railway line at Melbourne, and as the Government had recognized that by order-in-council, giving 6,400 acres per mile, and as this difficulty has only arisen by finding on the map that the land could not be given alongside of the road, I think it is the duty of the Government to assist the Company out of the dilemma. My suggestion is the one I have mentioned, the Government and the Company agreeing on a point further west: that difficulty could be obviated in that way. I do not see why it should be postponed; it need not take long to bring an Order-in-Council down.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I will inquire and see what can be done.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am glad to see that my hon. friend from Ottawa is in favor of subsidizng railways now. I understood him to say the other day that it was a sort of bribery.

HON. MR. SCOTT—My remark had reference to subsidies to railways in another part of the Dominion. I quoted the roads I referred to.

HON. MR. DICKEY—Is there not a question of the power of this House to amend the Act to give aid to another railway.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, we cannot amend it ; that is why I said if anything could be done it must be by a new bill. I will be very glad to assist my hon. friend in any way I can.

HON. MR. POWER—A question of policy arises under the first clause, on which I would ask the opinion of the Minister of Justice. As I understand, the company for which the subsidy is provided in the first clause of the Bill propose to build, or are already building, a narrow gauge road to the Canadian Pacific Railway, a road with a gauge of three feet six inches. Now the inconvenience of that system, I think, is plain on the face of it : that when the coal comes down from the mines of this company it cannot be carried on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Winnipeg or any of the places where it is likely to be consumed, but has to be transshipped where the branch railway reaches the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I think it is a doubtful policy, to encourage the construction of a road of that sort. It would cost very little more in that country to build a road of the ordinary gauge, from which trains could be run over the Canadian Pacific Railway without any change or expense. I think it will tend to increase the price of coal to the people of the North-West considerably.

HON. MR. KAULBACH — That should be a question entirely in the hands of the company themselves. If they consider it in their interests ; if it is more economical for them to build a line that gauge, I do not think this Parliament should interfere.

HON. MR. POWER—If they did not ask a subsidy from us, of course, it would be a matter for themselves to decide.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The North-Western Coal and Navigation Company got a charter to build their railway on the narrow gauge. It is not for us to say, because they adopt what I agree is not the best gauge, that we should not give them assistance. They got a charter to build on this narrow gauge : they have gone to great trouble and expense : they have raised money in England and in this country for the purpose of building the road on the narrow gauge system. If they have chosen to adopt a bad gauge, it is their misfortune. At the same time their object is to transport coal, and to accomplish the end of their existence as a company. I should be very sorry to think that if they had made a mistake in that way, as alleged, we should withhold assistance. The House will see that they receive only 3,800 acres per mile, while the others get 6,400 acres. There are facilities now for transhipping coal which did not exist in other years, and which make a narrow gauge road much less objectionable than it would have been under the old system, and the expense of transshipping is not by any means great.

HON. MR. VIDAL, from the committee, reported the Bill without amendment, and it was then read the third time and passed.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (20), "An Act to modify the application of the Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877."

In the Committee,

On the second clause,

HON. MR. POWER—I wish to call attention to the fact that it has been suggested that another amendment is desirable, and I submit the suggestion to the Minister of Justice. I understand that there are certain companies which do

business in both ways; they do business under the assessment plan, and under the general plan, and under the wording of this clause it might be possible that a company that did business in both ways might be exempted from the operation of the Consolidated Insurance Act. The suggestion is that, after the end of the 20th line, after the word "purpose," we insert the words "not otherwise."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think it is necessary; the language is plain enough. This Bill as it now stands provides only for those companies which do business in one way—that is pay liabilities solely from the proceeds of assessments or dues collected from the members thereof for that purpose.

The clause was agreed to.

On the third clause,

HON. MR. POIRIER—I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if it is understood that such companies are bound to make a report at least once a year, or can they intermit one year, and just make their report when the Minister of Finance or the Superintendent of Insurance thinks proper?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—They are obliged by this clause to make a yearly report, and also to report when asked to do so, and in that way they may be required to make two reports annually.

The clause was agreed to.

On the sxith clause,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I propose to leave the sixth clause out altogether as the provisions of the 12th clause render it unnecessary.

HON. MR. POWER—The provisions of the sub-clauses of clause five all apply to foreign companies doing business in Canada; and the object of the sixth clause is to make certain sub-clauses of clause five apply to companies incorporated in Canada. I think it is a very proper provision, when a company of this kind is incorporated in Canada, that the death claims shall be a first charge, and that the money for such claims shall not be used for other expenses. I submit that for the protection of the public clause six should remain.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is no occasion to apply the sixth clause to ordinary companies.

HON. MR. POWER—Clause six makes the subclauses of clause five apply to companies doing business on the co-operative or assessment plan, that is all. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will consider the suggestion.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I will mention it to the Superintendent of Insurance. I move that the Committee rise and report the Bill.

HON. MR. WARK—As the subject of insurance is so seldom before Parliament it might be an opportune time to introduce an additional section which shall be a further amendment of the Act to which this Bill is an amendment, to afford a greater security to parties insured in Mutual Companies. These companies were established in order to insure at a cheaper rate than stock companies, because it is claimed that where no stock is subscribed, the management is less expensive. Where no stock is subscribed, and there are no stockholders, Mutual companies require no such profits, because the insured are under their own management or under their own liabilities. They induce individuals to insure under their management with the assurance that nothing more would be taken out of the proceeds than what was actually necessary for the management of the affairs of the company. A stock company, whose officers are appointed by the stockholders, are guarded against any unnecessary expenditure, whereas these companies have no such check upon them. They may appropriate whatever they think proper towards salaries and expenses, and the insured, who are scattered all over the country, are not present at the meetings. The Directors write to the insured for proxies, and re-elect themselves. I have had some transactions with the Union Mutual Company of Maine. Some years ago the

Inspector or Commissioner—I do not know what the title is—of Massachusetts threw some doubt upon the position of this company and it left its business to a number of individuals connected with insurance in different States. His report was published in the Montreal *Herald*, a copy of which I have in my hand. The company was organized in 1849 and commenced business. In 1876, the expenses of its management had swelled up to $654,408.45. Seven years after—in 1882-83—they found that they could conduct the affairs of this company for $266,667.07, much less than one-half. It is no wonder that the Commissioner of Massachusetts began to doubt the standing of this company, and how it was conducting its affairs. With respect to salaries, in 1876 it was found they amounted to $72,300.85; in 1883 they were reduced to $41,971.60—nearly one-half. I think the duty of Parliament would be to get such returns from those companies as would guarantee to the public the necessary information as to how the affairs of those companies are conducted. It will not do in these returns to say merely that the expenses of management are so much; we ought to require them to show how much they receive from the assured; how much of this goes to meet death liabilities; how much of it is set apart for the reserve fund; how much the balance is, and how much they return to the assured, because that is what they promise—to return all the savings or profits to the assured. Unless we know that, the public is not properly protected. I think I have made my views plain, and I ask the Minister of Justice whether it would not be a suitable time to require those companies to make such returns. I have had myself $55 returned at one time, and it got down the next time to $22 and a few cents, and I believe that the next year there was nothing divided at all, whereas I was assured in the policy that the profits would be increasing from year to year because I paid a very high premium.

HON. MR. DICKEY—My hon. friend did me the honor to call my attention to this matter, and I took the trouble to look into it, and I am under the impression that it is already provided for by the Act of which this is an amendment. The original Insurance Act of 1877 applies to such companies as my hon. friend has spoken of, and there is there a very stringent provision as to returns to be made by such companies under that Act. In the 20th section there is a provision that applies to companies incorporated in Canada, and I only notice it for the purpose of calling attention to the oath that is to be taken to returns made by such companies, and in a subsequent section applying to returns made by companies incorporated out of the Dominion. Then the next clause provides a severe penalty for not making the return. The Act seems to have met every possible contingency, and I am happy to find from reading the Statute that those provisions embrace the very class of cases that my hon. friend from Fredericton refers to, and it is fortunate that the public are protected in this way. If there are any cases where it has been overlooked, it is not the fault of the law, but because the law has not been enforced. Now that is very full in the 21st section, that is the section which affects the class of companies referred to "incorporated elsewhere than within Canada and at present licensed, or heretofore licensed, under this Act, which make annual statements of their condition and affairs under oath of their chief agent, and furnish the same to the Minister of Finance at the same time as Canadian Companies." Then the next clause provides a severe penalty for not doing that. That is not all, because under section 24, subsection 3, of the same Act, there is fortunately this further provision, of a most inquisitorial character, with regard to these companies that are incorporated out of the Dominion:—

"The Minister of Finance may, from time to time, instruct the superintendent of insurance to visit the head office of any Company licensed under this Act and incorporated elsewhere than within Canada, and to examine into the general condition and affairs of such Company; and if such Company declines to permit such examination, or refused to give any information necessary for such purpose in its possession or control, its license shall be withdrawn."

Now these provisions seem to have met every possible contingency and I am happy to find, at least according to my reading of the Act, that they embrace every class

of cases to which my hon. friend has adverted, and it is fortunate that parties are protected in that way. If the Act has been disregarded, it is not the fault of the law, for there are the provisions of the law if they are enforced.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—There is a special provision in the Act itself that no sum received for assessments shall be paid for salaries. These companies that are called assessment companies (into the merits of which I have only cursorily looked) seem to me to offer very considerable inducements, and if they are conducted, as they are said to be by the best New York actuaries, upon a sound principle, we are bound to receive the statements of those actuaries, because the principle of life insurance is very abstruse and difficult for laymen to understand. They provide also that there shall be a payment on each policy of a small separate sum to meet salaries. The salaries are entirely dependent on that payment and not on the assessments, and that seems to obviate, so far as they are concerned, a very crying evil. My hon. friend has very much the same knowledge of one or two companies that I have myself. This is an entirely different kind of insurance; it is a mutual insurance where the full policies are paid in and the insured divide their profits among themselves. My hon. friend refers to companies of an entirely different character. If this kind of insurance is based on a sound principle (and we are told that it is by those whose business it is to investigate those matters) it meets the wants of people who are not able to invest large immediate sums in policies,and young men who, perhaps, for a short time wish to take out policies. It is much cheaper than the ordinary system, and if it is a sound principle it is a great boon to the community, for everything which can facilitate and cheapen life insurance without hazarding the safety of the insured, ceatainly is to be hailed as a great step in advancing the interests of the community.

Hon. Mr. WARK—I think it would be desirable that the Minister of Justice should look into this matter and see if the Finance Minister has the power, or should exercise it, to have such returns made as I have referred to.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—I will draw the attention of the Superintendent of Insurance to the subject, and if the returns exacted are not in sufficient detail I will take care that the details are exacted to which my hon. friend refers.

The clause was adopted.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I rise for the purpose of saying that I think the Superintendent of Insurance must have misapprehended the force of the 6th clause of the Bill. I think that clause is calculated to protect the interests of the public and to limit rather than increase the liberties of these assessment companies. I think that a careful scrutiny of that clause by the Superintendent will lead him to see that he misapprehended its force when he read it over.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—Before this clause is adopted I wish to mention some objections which I have to it. By striking out section 6 we have subsections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9, of subsection 5, not applying to our Canadian companies, and therefore the Bill, as it is, only applies to foreign companies. Our Canadian co-operative companies have the full benefit of the law. They have its protection, and none of the obligations that are imposed upon regular companies. They are not obliged to give any satisfactory account of their business; they can do what they like with the money they get; they can use the money they receive from assessments as they please, and they can pay themselves whatever salaries they like. We are aware that. last year, one co-operative company in Montreal paid its officers thirty or forty thousand dollars, not from assessments, but from entrance fees and annual dues. If they are at liberty to use also the assessment fees in that way, they can make themselves pretty happy. If we strike out section 6, which excludes all our Canadian companies from the operation of this Act, then let us add to section 5, at the end of the 4th line, the following words: " and also to Canadian companies." This would include all

companies, Canadian and foreign, as I think this Bill should. Our laws are very strict with regard to stock companies, which are called old line companies. They have to make a heavy deposit and have a large reserve. Before they can get a permit to begin business they must deposit $50,000 with the Minister of Finance, and, further, they have to deposit additional sums as the Minister of Finance, and the Superintendent of Insurance think proper, and we know that some strong companies have deposited with the Government as much as $750,000. I believe that is perfectly right, and that we should protect the people who insure, because that business is not well understood even by lawyers, and laymen who do not understand it at all, should be protected. I approve of rigorous measures being adopted, but under this Bill those measures would only apply to companies which are already safe, and which have capital in some cases amounting to $30,000,000, or $40,000,000, while the assessment companies, having no assets whatever, are permitted to enjoy all the benefits of the law while they incur none of its charges or obligations. Again, I think that is not right. We ought to protect our people, and protect the regular companies doing business on sound principles, against companies which have no assets whatever and cannot even be brought before a court of justice to compel them to meet their obligations—companies represented by respectable men some of them, but others having at their head men who have not a cent of their own invested. If such companies should fail, as I could prove they almost all invariably do, because their basis is a false one, they ought to be required to bear the same burdens as regular companies. They should not enjoy all the privileges and be subject to none of the responsibilities imposed by the law upon stock companies. For my part, I protest against cancelling clause 6, which limits the application of clause 5 to foreign companies, without the words I have mentioned being added to the 5th clause, which would bring all Canadian companies under the Act.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There may be something in the point which the hon. gentleman takes. I will consult the Superintendent of Insurance on the subject and bring the matter up when the Bill is before us for third reading, The effect of the language added to the fifth clause would be what he describes. I will consult the Superintendent of Insurance and see if there is any objection to the proposed amendment.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I do hope the Minister of Justice will make a careful examination of this Bill and look into it thoroughly.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is what we have been doing.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—Because it contains some clauses that are most vicious. Many of these companies, when they are started, have not the least background to work upon. Take a stock company which has to deposit $50,000 with the Finance Department, and you have not only the security of the stockholders, but you have also the security of the deposit. Now these mutual insurance companies pretend to insure for almost nothing, which everybody knows cannot be done, and they go on doing a business that kills the regular insurance companies and does not at the same time protect the interests of the people who are insured with them. I could mention more than one case in Canada already where policyholders have come to grief, simply because this was not done. I hope the Minister of Justice, with his usual care of all Acts that are introduced here, when the Bill comes before us again will look into it most carefully and see that provision is made for a proper deposit before such companies are allowed to go into operation at all.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Certainly, I will see about that before the third reading.

HON. MR. DEVER, from the committee, reported the Bill with amendments, which were concurred in.

The Senate adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Wednesday, July 8th 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

MOTION.

HON. MR. POWER moved

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before this House, copies of the Petitions of the County Council of the County of Drummond, in the Province of Quebec, and of other Petitions asking for a Survey of the Central or Richmond route, for the proposed Short Line Railway from Montreal to St. John and Halifax.

He said: For various reasons I have not had time to be brief in connection with the notice I have given. I am very sorry, but I have preferred to speak to this motion to-day rather than to defer it until to-morrow, because I see from the notice paper that there is very little business before us to-day, and our time is likely to be fully occupied to-morrow. I need hardly remind hon. members that the Statute of 1884 provided a subsidy for a line of railway from Montreal to the ports of St. John and Halifax by the shortest and best practicable route to be ascertained after the surveys of engineers. Now, I wish hon. gentlemen to bear that in mind: that the object of the subsidy was not a short line to St. Andrews; it was not a short line to any port in the State of Maine—but it was the shortest and best practicable line from Montreal to St. John and Halifax.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Does the hon. gentleman not think that we might better discuss this when the Bill for the short line is before us.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not think so.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No body can reply or explain now.

HON. MR. POWER—I think it is the same thing to the Minister. There is not much to be done to-day, and what I have to say to-day will not be said to-morrow when the Bill comes up, so that the thing is about as broad as it is long; and further I think it well that the Minister should be in possession of the views that are entertained by a great many persons on the subject before he introduces the Bill here; and he will be in a better position then to answer those objections than if he did not know what they were.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The policy of the Government might be changed by it.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not think the policy of the Government is likely to be changed by what I say, but the Minister will understand better what objections there are to the policy.

HON. MR. PLUMB—They will be instructed by the hon. gentleman.

HON. MR. POWER—I dwelt on this matter at some length in March last, when moving for surveys and reports which have been since laid on the Table of the Senate, and I do not wish to trouble the House with repeating what I then said. The return shows that as far as I went I was pretty accurate then, although my statements were made without official information; and it shows too that there was no survey made of the shortest line—the line of which I spoke—by the central route; and on this point I ask to be allowed to read a portion of an article which appeared in one of our Nova Scotia papers, when Mr. Schreiber's report on the short line was first made public. This article puts the thing more tersely and better than I could by far.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Who is the author of the report?

HON. MR. POWER—The paper I am reading from is the Halifax *Herald*, which is an organ of the Government.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Who is the author of the article?

HON. MR. POWER—It is an editorial written by the responsible editor of the *Herald.*

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—You might spare us the editorial.

HON. MR. POWER—The articles in the *Halifax Herald* are sometimes very well written and very interesting to the Government, and I think after the Minister has heard a little of this one he will think it remarkably well worth reading:

"Mr Schrieber's report on the Short Line surveys, shows that there has been a great deal of surveying done in connection with that project, and that a large and varied assortment of routes has been provided by which a "short line" from Montreal to the ocean seaboard of the Maritime Provtnces may be constructed. If variety in choice were any advantage, we should say that a great work had been accomplished by the various surveying parties of whose work Mr. Schrieber gives us an analysis and epitome. The result of their labors, proves that they did a great deal of surveying, that they examined a great number of routes, and that they placed within the reach of the Government and people of Canada a large amount of information respecting several districts of Quebec, New Brunswick and the State of Maine, hitherto but imperfectly known. But we are afraid that when that is said, the best possible is said of their work. To us it appears that their surveys have been very largely of impossible routes, while the route respecting which they were sent out to obtain information has yet to be examined. They were sent out to ascertain "the shortest possible line," and it only requires a glance at the map accompanying Mr. Schrieber's report to see that none of the lines surveyed can possibly be the shortest obtainable,—that is if Euclid was correct in his view that a straight line is the shortest possible line between two points."

Accompanying the report—as we have already intimated—is a map, purporting to be a 'map of the section of Canada and the United States lying between Montreal and Halifax.' It is prepared by the Department of Railways at Ottawa, with the special object of affording information on this very short line project. If any one will take the trouble to place this map on a table, and stretch a cord from Montreal to Moncton—the two termini of the projected line—they will find that the surveys of last summer are not in its neighborhood.

I will call the attention of the hon. member from Niagara to this part of the editorial because it will touch his poetic soul a little:—

"There are surveys to the right of it, surveys to the left of it, and surveys across it, but no survey whatever of the line—"the shortest possible line"—that it marks."

HON. MR. PLUMB—I do not pay much attention to the impertinences of the hon. gentleman from Halifax.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman is out of order. "Impertinences" is not a Parliamentary word; I suppose however we shall pardon the hon. gentleman as in the country he came from they were not so particular about Parliamentary decency as we are here.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is trespassing on the patience of the House.

HON. MR. POWER—The article continues:—

"According to the map the distance from Montreal to Moncton by an air line, such as indicated, is 416 miles. Of this, 76 miles, from Montreal to Richmond Junction, are built, and about 85 miles more, from Moncton to Fredericton are surveyed. So that all the country traversed by this air line, regarding which there can be any doubt, is the distance between Fredericton and Richmond Junction, of about 255 miles. Practically this was the only 'gap' in the proposed Short Line that need be surveyed at all. Yet of all the country 'between Montreal and Halifax' it appears to have been the most carefully avoided. Thus we have a line running almost parallel to it, 20 or 30 miles to the south; another starting 20 miles south of it, and crossing it twice; but none starting from Richmond Junction, for the purpose of ascertaining the shortest possible line between that point and Fredericton. Why is this? Why take Sherbrooke 20 miles the south of an air line, or Quebec 70 miles to the north as the starting point of several lines each, while Richmond Junction lying directly on an air line, is carefully avoided? The public certainly have a right to have this remarkable neglect explained.

"The best the surveyors of last summer can do in the way of shortening the distance between Moncton and Montreal is to reduce it from 662 miles—the distance at present by the Intercolonial Railway and Grand Trunk—to 532 miles, or a saving of but 132 miles. If anything like an air line were built the distance would not be greater than 450 miles—or even 80 miles less than the shortest of the 30 lines yet surveyed. And of course what is true of Moncton is true of Halifax. The maximum reduction in our case is from 890 miles—the distance at present by rail between Halifax and Montreal—to 720 miles.

It is hardly necessary to point out that with the ever increasing speed of railway locomotion the value of such a reduction in distance will every year be growing less. But even at present we doubt if many people in Nova Scotia will feel like supporting an expenditure like that contemplated for the Short Line Railway, to secure a reduction of only 130 miles in the distance to Montreal. It may be worth the money, but there are people who will persist in thinking that it would be possible to make a more judicious use of our means."

The table of distances which I submitted to the House in March showed that the Central Route would shorten the distance from Montreal to Halifax over 200 miles, that it would make the distance from Montreal to Moncton 467 miles, to Halifax 654 miles, and to St, John 425; and the report which we have of the survey made of that portion of the line in question which was surveyed confirms the figures which I then gave, and no one has attempted to show that they are incorrect. I may say now, feeling certain of what I am saying, what I ventured to state then, from the information in my possession, that there are no serious engineering difficulties in the way. I presume hon. gentlemen who are interested in the matter have looked over the reports of the various engineers who were employed to make those surveys. As to these particular lines I shall quote from page 32 of the report—this is the report on the line from Chesuncook Lake to Canterbury, by Vernon Smith :—

"On the whole the route proposed presents a very favorable line for the construction of an economical first-class railway. On the profile shown there is no gradient exceeding 1 per 100, or 53 feet per mile, and no curve of over 4° or 1,433 feet radius. With the exception of three places, each of less than 6 miles in length, there is no necessity for even this gradient. By slightly increasing the earthworks, I believe that on a re-survey the objectionable points may be greatly improved, and that the whole distance from Harvey to Chesuncook may be covered with gradients not exceeding 35 feet per mile, and with no curve exceeding 3 degrees or 1,910 feet radius."

It appears, from the summary of grades and curves annexed to Mr. Smith's report, that the line in those respects is an exceptionally favorable one. Mr. Smith gives a careful estimate of the cost of the road—that is the cost of the whole road from the end of the International to Canterbury—and he makes the average cost per mile $16,217. Hon. gentlemen will see that that is a cheap road, and the reports of Mr. Duffy and Mr. Smith show that there are no difficulties in the way, very few bridges to build, and that the gradients are favorable. When the matter was under consideration in March there was a good deal said about an all-Canadian route. The surveys have shown that those routes, in addition to being too long to be by any possibility called short lines, are replete with engineering difficulties. We really do not need any other all-Canadian route than we have. We have the Intercolonial which is a very good all-Canadian route. On the former occasion I made a comparison between the International and the Central routes, and I gave a table of distances by the International route. At the time I had given the benefit of the doubt to the International; and I find on referring to Mr. Schreiber's report that the International line instead of being 460 miles to St. John, as I made it, is 472, and tha instead of being 701 miles to Halifax, as I made it, is 720.

HON. MR. PLUMB—That shows the disadvantage of the hon. gentleman bringing those questions down before he is sure of the correctness of his figures and making some statements concerning it.

HON. MR. POWER—There is this difference between the hon. gentleman and myself: I do not make a practice of making statements that I am not fairly informed about, and in making the error I made it against myself. There was just one portion of the road the length of which I had no means of finding out, and I made that less than it really was.

HON. MR. PLUMB—You stated it as a fact: you were giving us information then as you are now.

HON MR. POWER—My hon. friend does not know what I stated.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I have it before me. The hon. gentleman stated it as a fact.

HON. MR. POWER—I did not state it as a fact. I stated it as an approximation.

HON. MR. PLUMB—You did not use that term at all.

HON. MR. POWER—I appeal to the chair to preserve order. The hon. gentleman has no right to interrupt me. If he is able to establish that I mis-stated anything he can do so after I have done, but it is altogether improper to interrupt one as he is doing.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It is very easy to establish it: I do not think I shall take the trouble.

HON. MR. POWER—I was just saying, when I was so improperly interrupted, that the mistake which I made when dealing with the International was that I made it some 20 miles shorter than it really was, and I made that mistake in the distance between the end of the railway and Matawamkeag. I thought the distance was somewhat less than it really is. Mr. Schreiber's report makes the southern route 47 miles longer to St. John and 56 miles longer to Halifax and Moncton than the central route. Then another element which enters into the construction of a railway of this sort is the summit-level, and I notice that although the Address which was presented by this House to His Excellency asked for a statement of the highest summit level on each of those routes, the report brought down gives none of the summit levels. I I do not wish to say that there is any improper object in that omission; but I may be allowed to state that the summit on the Southern or International road is admitted to be considerably higher than on any of the others. Then the grades on the International Railway are as high as seventy-four feet to the mile, and there are a good many of them; and on the portion of the contemplated road east of Moosehead Lake, the Engineer Spoffard, and his assistant Burpee, report a very difficult road to construct with a continuance of heavy grade. That road will involve the construction of a bridge across Moosehead Lake, which if built in the usual way of iron with stone foundations would probably cost about half a million of dollars. On this southern route at the border the summit is nearly 1900 feet; then after crossing Moosehead Lake which is about 1,000 feet above the sea level you have to go up some 600 feet within a very few miles.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It is not proposed to cross Moosehead Lake.

HON. MR. POWER—If my hon. friend reads Mr. Schreiber's report he will find that it is proposed to cross it. I think, in fact, that will not be done, because it is alleged that by crossing Moosehead Lake the saving in going to Matawamkeag over the other way going round by the Bangor and Piscataquis road would be only some thirteen miles, and the steep grades that have to be gone up between Moosehead Lake and Matawamkeag would more than counterbalance that gain. The road would be practically longer to go over these hills than to go round; and I have no doubt the road will go round and not go up. If the figures given for the Central route are correct, and as far as we have had an oppoetunity of verifying them they have been shown to be quite accurate, then there is no comparison whatever between the Central route for the short line of railway and any other route. It is incomparably the best. I will not go over the advantages other than the character of the road which I mentioned before. I may briefly say that one of the great advantages is that it would have the whole northern part of the State of Maine to itself and could not be tapped by any American line or any American port. Hon. gentlemen are probably aware that a good deal of controversy has arisen between Mr. Schreiber and one of the engineers employed by the Department in connection with these surveys, that is Mr. Light. I do not propose to enter into that controversy at any length. Mr. Light has answered for himself, and the figures speak for themselves. I have, for my own satisfaction, made a little calculation—taking the recognized figures—with this result: That the length by the southern line, the International line—the distance from Montreal to St. John, leaving out the question of gradients and all that, but just taking the distance in

miles—is 472. By Mr. Light's line it is 481. And the distance to Halifax by the International line is 720 miles, and by Mr. Light's line 710 miles, so that apparently as far as regards the mere item of distance, the International line has an advantage of nine miles to St. John over Mr. Light's line, and Mr. Light's line has an advantage of ten miles over the other one to Halifax. It is alleged, and the reports of the engineers on the different lines go to show that it is truly alleged, that the superiority of Mr. Light's line in the matter of gradients and curves will more than make up for the difference of nine miles to St. John, and will still further increase the advantage of his line in going to Halifax. I do not propose to enter at length into this controversy, but anyone who has read Mr. Schreiber's report, and has also seen Mr. Light's reply, will see that, to say the least of it, Mr. Schreiber does not treat his subordinates in a very courteous way. I find at page 51 of the official report some few comments of Mr. Schreiber's on, Mr. Light's report. First he says that :—

> Mr. Light, on pages 2 and 3, expresses a belief that the maximum grade between Quebec and Moncton by way of Chesuncook and Harvey would be 35 to 40 feet per mile, and that the surveys of last season have established that the grades above-mentioned can be obtained between Chesuncook and Harvey.

Then Mr. Schreiber, commenting on that, says :—

> Mr. Vernon's Smith's survey, the only one made between Chesuncook and Harvey last season, shows maximum grades of 53 feet per mile.

But as Mr. Light properly remarks, Mr. Smith, in the passage I read in the beginning of those remarks, shows that that grade can be reduced to 35 or 40 feet. Mr. Schreiber says :—

> "Mr. Light gives, on page 7, the distance from Montreal to Harvey, *via* Quebec, as 248 miles.
>
> This should be 406 miles."

Mr. Schreiber here omits the words "to build" used by Mr. Light, which make all the difference in the world.

I have taken Mr. Schreiber's own figures for the purpose of comparison, and I do not propose to introduce Mr. Light's character as an engineer, or Mr. Schreiber's character as an engineer into this debate. I shall only say this about Mr. Schreiber, that I am not aware of any instance where that gentleman has made a report against the well understood wishes of his chief. I do not think that there is any record of any case where Mr. Schreiber has made a report adverse to what was understood to be the wish of his chief. I notice that in another place some hon. members took occasion to make very serious charges against Mr. Light in connection with this matter. I think the better way would have been to have shown that Mr. Light's calculations and figures were wrong, and not to have gone into his previous history, which does not concern us in this matter at all. Mr. Light recommends a combination line which would be identical with the Central route as far as the north end of Chesuncook lake, and then would run up to Quebec by the Etchemin and Famine rivers, while a branch of it would run down to connect with the International railway by the line surveyed by Mr. Duffy. I throw out the suggestion that a better combination than that can possibly be had, for if, instead of following the International all the way to its termination, which is eight miles east of the border of Maine, we leave the International at the north end of Lake Megantic, which is some 21 miles west of the end of the road, and going down the Chaudiere river and diverge when we get some distance to the north east, we reach, by going altogether for some 46 miles, the Portage pass leading into the state of Maine. Then by continuing the Levis and Kennebec road from its present terminus to that same point, a distance of about 30 miles, we have both the branches of the combination line in the Province of Quebec free from the control of any foreign state, or any foreign corporation, and we would have to build in the State of Maine just the one line north of the mountains, and that is a line which does not interfere at all with any American road, and could not excite any hostility. You can come best to the border of Maine, across the northern portion of that State, and then go north to Quebec by the Levis and Kennebec road, or go south to Lake Megantic and there connect with the International. That would involve the construction of comparatively little railway except on our own territory, and it would

probably satisfy for the present at any rate, the wants both of Quebec and the Eastern Townships. By and by if the business grew, the road by the Etchemin river could be constructed also. The objections to the southern line, which appears to be the line favored by the Government judging from the resolutions introduced in the other Chamber, I have given already at some length. There are two or three of them to which I venture to refer again. One of the objections is that this is a route intended for United States business ; and I may say that the hon. member for Stanstead, in the other House, almost admitted that in the recent discussions on the resolutions. He said in so many words that one great business of the road would be to carry freight down to Bangor—that there would be a great deal of freight going to Bangor over this road. I do not think it is the object of this country in granting this subsidy, to enable the people of Bangor to get their freights easily. The object,as I stated at the beginning, was to give the best possible connection with St John and Halifax the commercial capital of New Brunswick, and the commercial and political capital of Nova Scotia. There is talk of doing something to build up St. Andrews, or some little place in that neighborhood. That was not the object of the subsidy ; the object was not to build up some unknown place on the western borders of New Brunswick into a considerable town ; but to connect the present business centres of the two Lower Provinces with the business centre of the Dominion ; and it would be very small comfort indeed to the people of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and New Brunswick to know that this International road was likely to carry a good deal of freight to and from Bangor. Another objection to this road is that its gradients render it unfit for heavy freight or for speedy passenger trains. A very important objection to this road, which has not been sufficiently adverted to is this : this road—the road between the Eastern Townships, and the lower provinces, will be really under the control of the Maine Central railway. The traffic will have to pass over the railway owned by the Maine Central Company and will be dependent upon the good will of the directors and shareholders of that company. I think that is a very unfortunate position in which to place our traffic. The people of Maine and the railway men of Maine will be sure to see that they get the best of any bargain that they make with our people in connection with the business going by that road ; and the natural tendency on their part will be to bring the trade down to their own harbor at Sullivan below Bangor. Then it has been given as a reason why we should select this southern route that it will utilize existing roads, and will not involve the building of quite as much new road as some other lines would. It should not be an advantage in our eyes that the route that is proposed is going to utilize a certain amount of American railway, and that is what the fact is. I do not think that that is an argument in favor of the road at all. Then some of the gentlemen who are opposed to the central and compromise route, and who advocate the southern route, say, "very well, supposing that this is the best line, there will be no session of the Maine Legislature until 1887, and you will not have a chance to get a charter for it." In reference to that I may say it is an objection which is of very little weight ; because if any hon. gentleman will take the trouble to consult the Revised Statutes of Maine he will find that it is not necessary to get a charter from the legislature at all in order to incorporate a company to build a railway in the State of Maine. All that is necessary is for a number of persons—and this is what is done—to file articles of association with the railway commissioners and to go through some other forms.

If the line of railway were proposed to be located in the immediate neighborhood of an existing road, then there might be some difficulty raised about it ; but as this central road would not interfere with any other line there could be no question at all as to getting a charter. Another thing it does not cross any navigable water. One of the reasons why the International Railway Company had to go to the Legislature for permission to locate their road as they proposed to do is that it crosses navigable water at Moosehead Lake, and it also trespasses on the ground of two American railways, and comes into their neighbourhood ; and the result was that the charter was granted only on the

condition that the company should make connection with those American railways. There is really nothing, I think, in that objection at all. Another reason given for selecting this southern route is that it is said that something must be done at once; that the Canadian Pacific Railway wishes the southern route, and more to that effect. On that point I wish to be allowed to refer to another article from the Halifax *Herald*:—

In the first place the plea that further surveys will lead to further delay, and that further delay will force the C. P. R. to secure another winter outlet, for next season at least, could have been urged in the session of 1884 just as effectively as it can now. If expedition in securing a winter port for the C. P. R. is the principal thing to be considered, then it was folly to waste the whole summer of 1884 making surveys of all kinds of impossible routes. But we contend that it is not the principal object the country has in view in promoting the Short Line railway scheme. What the people of Canada want, and what the Government have promised to assist them in securing, is "the shortest possible line" between Montreal and the Atlantic ports of the Lower Provinces. And it was solely with a view of ascertaining what the shortest practicable line really was, that the surveys of last summer were authorized. And if, as is apparent, these surveys have so far wholly failed of their object, then certainly they should be continued until the shortest possible line has been clearly ascertained. To stop surveying at present, on the plea that it will cause delay, is tantamount to saying that all we want is *a* short line, no matter if it reduces the distance between Montreal and Sullivan's Harbor three times as much in proportion as it reduces the distance between Montreal and Halifax. And that is a proposition that we do not think "Merchant" or any other man in Canada—much less in Nova Scotia—would care to openly advance.

It does not seem to me to me that it makes very much difference to the people of the Lower Provinces or for that matter to the people of the upper provinces, whether the Short Line is in the hands of the Pacific Railway Company or not. Whoever owns the road will not have a monopoly of the business. The Intercolonial railway will always be a rival road, and the proposed road by Edmonston and River Ouelle will afford another rival line; and whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company own this Short Line, or whether an independent company own it, or whether the Grand Trunk Railway own it is of very little consequence. The great thing is to get the shortest and best road. I think under all the circumstances, that it must strike every hon. gentleman as being singular that no survey was made of the central route. The only ground on which that survey could have been omitted one would suppose is that nobody had suggested it. I think that that would not be an excuse, because it is so plain that it should have suggested itself to the Chief Engineer and the Railway Department without any suggestion from outside. But I have been informed and verily believe that several petitions asking for the survey of the central route have been sent to the Government or to the Railway Department, and the resolution which I have the honor to move asks for copies of those petitions. If it is a fact that those petitions have come in there will be no excuse whatever for the conduct of the Government in omitting to have the survey of this route made. There is just one circumstance to which I may be pardoned if I call attention now. The chief engineer in his report states that the route which he recommends, route No. 5 to St. John and No. 6 to Halifax, is the best, and the only reason he gives for its being the best is that, while it is the same distance to St. John by that line as by line No. 8 which runs north of Moosehead and Chesuncook Lakes, it is one mile shorter to Halifax by the route across Moosehead Lake. It would strike one as being rather singular as the roads run together nearly all the way from Canterbury to Halifax that one should be a mile shorter than the other. If any hon. gentleman will turn to page 9 of Mr. Schreiber's report he will find that in giving the distances by line number 9 he puts down section B of the survey at 212 miles. On referring to the engineer's report I find that the distance is only 210 miles; so if you subtract that two miles which Mr. Schreiber has inadvertantly added to the distance by the northern line, you make that route a mile shorter than the southern line instead of a mile longer; and if it was such a triumphant and conclusive reason for selecting the Southern line that it was a mile shorter, we have the same conclusive reason for selecting the Northern line, for it is a mile shorter. That is not the only

misrepresentation—unintentional I presume of course—that I find in this report. Mr. Schreiber gives the unsurveyed portion of the line from the point of junction near Harvey, New Brunswick to Moncton, as being 119 miles, that is, on the Northern line, number 9. On the line which he selects, No. 6, he gives the portion not surveyed, 113 miles. The portion not surveyed on No. 6 ought to be longer than the portion unsurveyed on the other. I am not going to show that now, but such is the case. The truth is, adopting the southern line to the end of the International, it is really shorter to go round the north of Moosehead and Chesuncook Lakes, to Halifax, and the same distance to St. John, as by the route which the engineer has recommended.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I was in hopes that the hon. gentleman who has introduced this matter would have taken the suggestion of the leader of the House and deferred his remarks until such time as the question of a Short Line Railway came up in a more direct manner, and probably then they would have afforded more interest to members, and it would have opened up a wider discussion than it has, owing to the time and manner in which it has been introduced. I do not complain of my hon. friend's criticism : it is essential, I think, that there should be a full criticism of this matter in view of the interests and money involved, that no false step should be taken. What my hon. friend has said is true : that we have the chief engineer of railways reporting in favor of a certain line which the acting Minister of Railways has, no doubt, some interest in, and which the Canadian Pacific Railway would be inclined to favor. Therefore, there is greater reason why this House and Parliament should more carefully watch the proposition and action of the Government in regard to the line which it is proposed to establish. I do not exactly agree with my hon. friend in much that he has said. I do not think he has decided himself where this line ought to go whether by the North Shore and cross near Quebec, or via Richmond to Canterbury. When this matter came up before, under an array of figures from my hon. friend I opposed his views, I said that any line crossing the river at Montreal and going in an easterly direction even without any inclination south, must be to a large extent a feeder to the Railway system of the United States, and my hon. friend had the audacity—if I may be permitted to say so—to tell me in effect that I did not know what I was talking about. It seems now that I converted him, that he has changed his mind and his views are in consonance with what I then said. My hon. friend is in favor of a line to Quebec and from there by the Chaudiere down to Canterbury, or by the road from Richmond across to Canterbury.

HON. MR. POWER—I think the route by Richmond is the shortest and best, but if we cannot get that I think the other should be had, the Combination line.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Exactly, so my hon. friend is coming to my views in entering into the combination line with me now, to avoid if possible getting entangled with the railway system of the United States. He says it does not matter who builds or owns this Short line railway. Our people in the Maritime Provinces are inclined, I think, as far as possible, to have the Canadian railways, freed from any foreign system of railways to maintain them against foreign rivals. We are inclined to regard the Canadian Pacific Railway as the national highway of the Dominion, and wish it extended to the extreme end of Nova Scotia. To facilitate trade between the Maritime Provinces and the west, it is believed that we should have a continuous line in the hands of one company. The road being in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway they will have an interest in carrying the trade upon their line as far as possible, and conveying it to ports in the Maritime Provinces, making them the winter ports for the grain of our North-West. So when my hon. friend says it is immaterial what line of railway this connects with I think he is neither advocating the interests of Canada as a whole, nor of the Maritime Provinces, nor what the people of those provinces conceive to be their interests when asked to pay $250,000 a year for 20 years. My hon. friend says there is no objection to some delay.

HON. MR. POWER—Excuse me, I did not say that.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The hon. gentleman's remark was tantamount to that—that the people of the Maritime provinces were not so anxious about that as to get the shortest line.

HON. MR. POWER—I did not say that.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—My hon. friend conveyed that meaning, and he knows that for a number of years the clamor in the Maritime provinces has been to secure the trade to their winter ports, and when there is an opportunity to get a short railway they do naturally object to any delay which can be avoided. I am not in favor of this route myself; I do not believe it is the line which should be adopted, or that by it very much of the winter port traffic will ever reach Nova Scotia, but at the same time his contention here, if approved of, would probably be the means of delaying the construction of any road for an indefinite time, and the final result might be that we would get no short railway. As regards the route, my hon. friend says it is immaterial where it goes through the state of Maine—that it might go, and there was nothing to stop it going, north of Moosehead Lake. Now we know very well that the State of Maine has control, at least in the locating of all railways within its borders. Will my hon. friend tell me that you can run a railway through the State of Maine whether the state authorities approve of it or not? We know that it cannot be done in any country and that it cannot be done in the State of Maine. They are alive to their own interests. When the Megantic line, which is proposed as a part of our Short Line was run through the State of Maine the company wanted to have the option to go north or south of Moosehead Lake, but they were forced to go south. What did the State of Maine say? "You cannot go north of Moosehead Lake, because we want to make your line tributary to our system of railways, and if you go north of Moosehead Lake we will not derive the advantages that we expect from your road." This is very significant; they refused a charter north of the lake to the Megantic Railway for that reason. Therefore to say, as my hon. friend says, we must go along the north shore of Moosehead Lake is in effect saying that we cannot go through the State of Maine at all with the Richmond and Canterbury route. All these things must be considered, and if my hon. friend thinks that we can do as we please with the State of Maine he is entirely mistaken. In order to find an argument to sustain the position he has taken, he has really misrepresented, I think, the obligations as well as the disadvantages and restrictions we are under in attempting to construct a railway through that portion of the State of Maine. To put any railway even in the manner in which he says from Richmond to Canterbury is not, as my hon. friend asserts, constructing it north of the range of mountains, because the rivers do run southward of the shortest line that can be drawn between those two points. That is perfectly obvious to any one who will glance at the matter—the natural inclination of the country is southward, even the waters of Lake Chesuncook flow to Bangor, and therefore he is wrong in supposing that the mountain range would keep our traffic from being drawn to the United States ports. I am not satisfied that all that could be done to satisfy this House or country with data has been accomplished; the surveys are not sufficient to establish the shortest and best practical line, if I am rightly informed, between Matamamkeag Lake and St. Andrews, because 60 miles of the proposed short line is yet unsurveyed. I am told by some parties that there is a fair route for a railway through there. Others say that there is not: that it is almost impracticable to put a line through there. Therefore I do not think that the Government have sufficient data to decide upon any line as being the shortest and best practicable route between the Maritime Provinces and Montreal. But even after the shortest line is discovered, there is a great deal more to be considered—the summits, curves, gradients, the engineering features and also the character of the country through which it is to pass. All these have to be considered, and we should be cautious before we construct a railway for over 150 miles through the State of Maine,

developing a foreign country. I have always felt and yet feel great reluctance to spend our money on an enterprise of that kind, although not to do so seems to be adverse to the feelings and conceived interest of the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I have contended from the first that a line down to Quebec on the north shore and thence via the Chaudiere to Canterbury would not increase the length of the line to such an extent as should prevent us building it as a short line of railway; and although the Government may have decided on this line, the International, yet my views have not been changed. We find on that combination line the maximum grades are not heavy—that is if Mr. Light's figures are correct, and I am sure that the position he has held in this country, in the confidence and the employ of the Governments of Nova Scotia, and Quebec, and of the Dominion, give him an engineering standing of importance, notwithstanding what those interested in the Southern route say of him. Mr. Light says that the maximum grades would be 35 or 40 feet per mile, on combination line from Chaudiere, and the maximum curves 4 degrees. He says that the distance from Montreal to Halifax by that route is 710 miles, 337 of which are to be built, and from Montreal to St. John 481 miles, 242 of which remain to be built. If these figures are correct there is not such a divergence, or difference in distance, between a line by the North Shore and the Southern route, as to justify the Government subsidy to the latter route. The Government seem pledged to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec. If they are committed to that and if they have decided to expend some $1,500,000 to accomplish that object, it is a grave question for us to consider, and the country will consider it, whether we should build or subsidize with $6,000 a mile another line of railway which would to a large extent be a rival to that running through a foreign country, and divert trade to a foreign country without any corresponding advantage to the Lower Provinces. As I said before, this argument has come upon us unawares and I have not given it that attention which it ought to receive. But although it has come upon us prematurely, in view of the policy of the Government to construct or subsidize a railway, under all the circumstances, considering that the Canadian Pacific Railway and Quebec ought fairly to be considered and favored by the Government, and that some member of the Goverment is known to be interested in the southern route, it is but fair that we should have a full discussion of the subject, although I am not quite satisfied with the criticism of my hon. friend from Halifax, believing it to be untimely, and that he himself is rather adrift and undecided as to where the road should be. Can we afford to wait—will the maritime provinces be satisfied to wait for an indefinite number of years for another route or until we obtain a right to carry the road, which my hon. friend rather advocates, through the State of Maine? All delays are uncertain, and, therefore, although I am prematurely speaking to this matter yet possibly Parliament may consider, in view of the clamor there has been for a winter port at Halifax and St. John, that the Government may have done wisely in acting as they have done, and pursuing a course which seems to be in accord with the views of the people's representatives in the other branch of Parliament.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The inconvenience of making addresses, such as my hon. friend from Halifax has delivered, must be very apparent to every member of the House. This is the third speech that he has favored us with upon a question which is not fairly before us, of which we have not been informed by any definite papers, and which is likely to come up for discussion on an important measure which will be submitted to us in two or three days. At the close of the session he moves for papers which cannot possibly be brought down this year, he has given us statements which cannot be conclusive, he quotes anonymous articles in newspapers, and reports of engineers who are rival professionals, and has gone, I think, very much out of his way to throw a slur on the Government engineer who, I think he said, if I understood him right, was never known to make a report contrary to the desire of the head of the Department It did not rest with my hon. friend to make such a statement as that: the engineer is not here to defend himself.

Looking back at his speech of the 17th March I find it is very much of the same character as the two speeches he has made yesterday and to-day. They cannot amount to anything, they take up the time of the House, they weary the members and are only productive of a few pages of the Debates, which the hon. gentleman may wish, for reasons known to himself, to fill up. I think a discussion of this kind should be left until we are seized of the facts—of what is to be the policy of the Government. When that is before us the hon. gentleman will have plenty of opportunity to attack it, and there are probably those here on the floor of the House who will take occasion to defend it. We will then have something before us. The hon. gentleman has made three attempts to prejudge a question which is a very important one to the people of the Maritime Provinces, and in fact to all of us, because we are all interested in having a direct route to the sea. We are all interested in having, as nearly as possible, one which will have the best grades and curves, which will give the nearest approach, which can be operated with the greatest saving and will open up the best country. Those are problems to be solved : the hon. gentleman has not approached them : I do not think there is a single man within the sound of his voice who is better able to come to a conclusion now than when the hon. gentleman commenced his speech. There is nothing in it : there is no conclusion in it, no definite information in it, nothing in it except the controversies with which we have been flooded for the last two or three months in regard to matters where the opinions of engineers differ so widely that its almost impossible for a non-professional man (and I do not suppose that my hon. friend claims to be anything else) to come to a conclusion. When we know what points we have to decide, then is the time for those arguments, and I trust that the hon. gentleman, having delivered himself on three different occasions, will spare us a speech when this measure comes before us.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—My intention was to say a few words on this question, but a discussion will probably take place on a Bill which is to come before us. I see that the House is anxious to have this motion disposed of and proceed to the orders of the day. I will therefore postpone my remarks until the Bill is before us.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is no objection to the address.

The motion was agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED INLAND REVENUE ACT, 1883, AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (146) "An Act to amend 'the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883.'" This is a Bill which relates almost exclusively to matters within the authority of the House of Commons, concerning the sale of spirits, the stowage of packages, penalties for violations of the Act, distilleries, breweries, tobacco and cigar manufacturers, etc. When the Bill comes before us in Committee of the Whole we can find out if it contains anything that requires our special consideration.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time.

DOMINION DRAINAGE COMPANY'S BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. MR. PLUMB moved the second reading of Bill (28), "An Act to incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company." He said—This seems to be a Bill to incorporate certain gentlemen a company for the purpose of undertaking the drainage of lands. They ask that they may have power to contract with the Crown or with any private person, firm or corporation, municipal or otherwise, for the drainage of their lands, and to supply or furnish all dredges, excavators and other implements, labor and materials requisite for such work, and to construct all canals, with lockage if necessary, that they may require to construct for effectual drainage, and to build and prosecute such work to completion.

They propose to have a capital of $400,000, in 8,000 shares of $50 each, the company to go into operation so soon as $200,000 of the capital have been subscribed. There is also a provision that the Joint Stock Companies Clauses Act of 1869 shall apply to this company. They contemplate working throughout Canada. It is well known that in the western part of Ontario, in the Counties of Kent and and Essex, there have been very large drainage works which have been of very great importance, and thousands of acres of fertile lands have been reclaimed and made arable by the application of a system of drainage, which is often so large and requires so much capital and plant, that it cannot be carried on very well by private individuals. The members of this com pany are well known contractors: among them are Angus P. McDonald, Alexander Manning, Peter McLaren, William John Morris, A. F. Manning, Randolph Macdonald and others. It seems to be a new scheme in this country, but I think it will commend itself to the House.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time.

HARBOR COMMISSIONERS OF THREE RIVERS BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (150), "An Act to authorize the advance of a certain sum to the Harbor Commissioners of Three Rivers."

In the Committee,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is evident that these commissioners are now paying six per cent, and it is proposed by this Bill to take up these debentures by new debentures to be issued at not more than four per cent., and to give them the difference between what is necessary to take up the $63,600 of old debentures, and the $82,000, to complete their works.

HON. MR. READ, from the committee, reported the Bill without amendment,

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (152) "An Act to amend the Consolidated Militia Act, 1883." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

Bill (154) "An Act further to amend the Acts relating to the culling and measuring of timber in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

Bill (156) "An Act to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into Canada." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

Bill (155) "An Act for the final settlement of the claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

The Senate adjourned at 4.50 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, July 9th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

DOMINION DRAINAGE COMPANY'S BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. MR. READ, from the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills, reported Bill (28), "An Act to incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company," with certain amendments.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The report of the committee shows that the amendments are merely verbal and I move that they be concurred in presently.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. PLUMB moved that the Bill be read the third time as amended.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF THREE RIVERS BILL.

THIRD READING.

The order of the day having been called for the third reading of Bill (150), "An Act to authorize the advance of a certain sum to the Harbor Commissioners of Three Rivers."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: I had put the third reading of this Bill off until to-day, because of an expression in the third clause which struck me, and it is this:—

"Upon the payment or advance of any sum under this Act to the said Harbor Commissioners, they shall deposit as such commissioners, with the Minister of Finance and Receiver-General their own bonds."

It is not meant that they should put in their private bonds, but their official bonds, and I would like the word "own" to be stricken out of the third clause.

The amendment was agreed to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of the Bill as amended.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

CONSOLIDATED INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The order of the day having been called for the third reading of Bill (20), "An Act to modify the application of the Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: When this Bill was appointed for third reading to-day I promised a member of the House from New Brunswick, who is now in his place, that I would consider again the sixth section of the Bill which in committee was stricken out altogether and which my hon. friend desired to have restored. It was to make certain sections of the Act apply to domestic companies as well as foreign companies. After conferring with the Superintendent of Insurance I think that the clause might remain, and therefore I assent to the suggestion made by my hon. friend from New Brunswick, and supported by the hon. member from Halifax that the clause be restored, and I now move that it be restored.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of the Bill as amended.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (103), "An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise." He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill a member of this House who is charged with that duty is met with the usual embarrassment attending the reception in the Senate of bills of this nature, and more particularly this Bill which has occupied so unusually a long time in the House of Commons. I shall not attempt to make any elaborate speech upon the subject which has already become so completely familiar to the ears of everybody who listens to me—a bill that has been debated in the other branch of Parliament for eight or nine weeks I believe, and not only the principles but the details discussed at such elaborate length that it is quite out of the question that any person proposing the second reading here will be able to offer any new observations on it, or will be able to present it to anybody in a new light. I will content myself therefore with alluding to the general reasons which present themselves to the Government for the creation of a general and uniform franchise throughout the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen know very well that by the charter of our liberties—by the Act under which this Parliament sits—the Confederation Act of 1867, it was contemplated that sooner or later, probably sooner than has been actually done, this Parliament would take into its own hands the franchise which governs the election of those who represent constituencies in the House of Commons. The provision in the Act of

Confederation was, that until other provisions should be made, by the Parliament of Canada, the franchise should remain as settled in the different provinces, and that it should constitute, until altered by Parliament, the franchise which should entitle gentlemen to seats in the House of Commons. It was evidently contemplated by the Imperial Parliament that at an early day the Parliament of the Dominion would take that subject into their hands and legislate for themselves as to the franchise which should govern the rights of those who sit in the House of Commons. Two methods suggested themselves by which this might be accomplished. One, which I confess recommended itself to me, was to take the franchises in the different provinces and crystalize them—adopt them as the Dominion franchise—each province by itself, and to put machinery in force by which the existing franchise in each province might be preserved unalterable except by the Parliament of the Dominion. That would have been a simple plan, and would have avoided some friction, because it would have given to the constituencies in each province the franchise to which they have been accustomed. But there were some grave objections to that system and I yielded my preference willingly. There was a want of symmetry in it; you would have members elected in one part of the Dominion by one franchise and in other parts of the Dominion by another franchise. There was a want of symmetry and harmony in it, and it does seem to recommend itself to one's judgment that, if it be possible, we should establish one and the same franchise throughout the whole Dominion. They would all be holding their seats by the same authority and by the same franchise, and it would have the tendency to unite us as one nation more than the other mode could possibly have done. There are arguments on both sides, but, on the whole, the system presented to the House for its consideration is the one which recommended itself to the Government, and is the one which, of the two, presents the more statesmanlike theory to this Parliament for its consideration. Having adopted that plan as the better of the two, then the question of lowering the franchise or making it higher was to point which the Government had to deliberate upon. The franchise which is now presented to the House for consideration is lower than it was found to exist at this moment in most of the provinces. It is a lower franchise than exists at this moment in Ontario, somewhat lower than that what exists in Quebec and in one or two of the other provinces. It is a franchise which is not only enlarged by reason of diminishing the standard in value, but it is enlarged by bringing into the body of constituents many persons who have not now votes. In many respects, therefore, I think the Bill ought to recommend itself to those members of this Honse who belong to the Reform party, because it is an enlargement of the franchise; because it gives votes to those who have not now votes, in many instances not only lowering the franchise, but including those who have not it at all. I understand, and I am sorry to hear that some of my hon. friends in this House to whose support I have long been indebted, and whom it is always a source of grief to me to find not in accord with the views that may be presented by the Government, are not satisfied with the franchise which is now offered for consideration, because it is too liberal in the way of bringing others in, because it lowers the franchise in a way which they think is inconsistent with conservative views. Those gentlemen come chiefly, I believe, from Quebec, and I am sure they will allow me to point out to them that if that evil is really deducible from the Bill, it is one which affects the province of Quebec much less than the other provinces because Quebec has a stable population not increasing rapidly, I apprehend in Quebec that the voters under this Bill, if it should become law, will be very much the voters who are on the lists now, but in the other provinces there would be an increased number of them. I hope too that my hon. friends from Lower Canada, some of whom, I believe, have this feeling, will bear in mind that there is a necessity imposed on every Government to keep time, as it were, with the events which are going on—to march in line with the general sentiment; and I think one may safely say in this country the general sentiment at this moment is in favor of giving

votes to all those who can safely be intrusted with them. We may not go so far as many gentlemen desire in this respect, but having endeavored to hit a point which would be half-way between the two. The Bill not only increases the constituents, but it also makes provisions for the regular registration of all those who may be entitled to vote, provisions which have excited a great deal of comment elsewhere, and which were supposed to indicate a deep design on the part of the Government to maintain their own positions and to keep the present Opposition where they are for years to come, a scheme which has been attributed to the Premier, and in which, I believe, it has been alleged by some of the Opposition, that he has had the assistance of his Satanic Majesty in devising. That is if true would go to show that we were making unholy alliances. I am happy to say that it is not true. The scheme is one which recommended itself to our judgment as one which enlarged the constituencies while, at the same time, it preserved some of the elements of conservatism which were,as we thought, sufficient to justify us in increasing, to the extent which the Bill does increase, the voters in the Dominion. Then the scheme contains provisions for the purpose of framing the original list of voters and of revising it from time to time. The officers appointed to do this duty are some of the judges of the land and revising barristers. It has been supposed that the judges would only be appointed occasionally, and that the normal state of things would be to employ revising barristers appointed by the Government, and therefore supposed to be in the interests of the Government; but assurances have been given elsewhere, and I repeat them here, that as far as it is possible to select judges under the Bill and as far as that can be done without interfering seriously with the discharge of their other duties they will be selected and barristers will only be appointed where this cannot advantageously be done. Of course in many counties of the Dominion where there is but one judge there are several electoral divisions,—divisions each of which is entitled to return a member, and it might be found impossible, in the administration of the Act, that the judge should have time to discharge completely the duty of a revising officer with reference to all the constituencies in his county, and other difficulties might arise which would render it desirable that they should not be employed the whole of their time, at all events, on the occasion of revising the list of those who have to vote, and revising barristers are therefore to be appointed. Why there should be such jealousy of revising barristers I do not completely understand. Revising barristers are to be men of five years' standing, and I myself have confidence that such a barrister, no matter from what party he might come, no matter in what province he might be appointed, would discharge his duty according to law. There grows up in the legal profession a respect for the law and a desire to discharge thoroughly and legally any duty which may be entrusted to a member of it. I should no more suppose that a revising barrister would wilfully go wrong in the discharge of this duty than he would wilfully go wrong in the discharge of his duties if he were made a judge or a commissioner. I do not appreciate or sympathize with the view which distrusts revising barristers because they are appointed by the Government. I cannot think that any man of five years' standing at the bar would wilfully sit down and write on the roll the name of a man who was not a voter. That seems to be an apprehension which my experience at all events does not justify. But there has been given in the case of any decision by a revising barrister, an appeal so that if the barrister should go wrong or disregard his duty, or be influenced without his knowledge perhaps by that bias which is supposed by some to be unavoidable—his political bias—there is an appeal which would bring his decision before a judge. Now, I think that of itself would be a sufficient check on any man to prevent him from doing that which is wrong—I would submit to the House that revising barristers are officers appointed in England, and there is no suggestion there that they discharge their duties unfairly or improperly. I know it will be said by my hon. friends opposite "Oh they are not appointed by the Government." It is true they are not appointed directly by the Government, but they are appointed by the Lord Chan-

cellor for the time being, and he is a member of the Government.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The Lord Chancellor appoints only in London; in the country revising barristers are appointed by the judge on circuit.

HON. MR. POWER—It is the Lord Chief Justice who makes the appointment in London not the Lord Chancellor.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It used to be the Lord Chancellor I think. That removes it one step from the Crown at all events, and in that respect it is a degree more distant from the centre of authority that it is under this Bill Here they are to be appointed by the Government, and they are to hold office during good behavior. That was a rule which it was supposed would be favorably received by any critic of the Bill, because a man once appointed is removed from all Government control or influence. That was the provision made with reference to the revising barristers, and with reference to the persons by whom they were to be appointed. Then when the Bill was finally before the House, certain exemptions to the general principle were made, one in Prince Edward Island, where the suffrage in the past was universal, and one in favor of British Columbia, where the suffrage was of the same character. In this House, some years ago, when Prince Edward Island entered the Union, a bill, which passed the lower chamber, which altered the franchise of that province, and which gave the franchise of those who had a right to vote for the members of the Legislative Council, as the franchise for those who voted for a member for the Commons, it was altered by the Senate, and we thought then that the franchise as it existed at that time in Prince Edward Island was the proper one for that province, and we made it so; so that this House, as far as its judgment went on that occasion, supported the principle of this Bill as laid down so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. The Senate has been much abused for that, and for other steps which they have taken in regard to bills which came from the House of Commons but that bill was never again presented to us. The justice of the course pursued by the Senate upon that occasion seems to have been admitted, and no subsequent effort was ever made to restrict the franchise of Prince Edward Island. British Columbia is in the same position, and hon. gentlemen will easily see that with reference to the provisions as stated, it was a much stronger step to take, and one more apart from all their past experience to say that there should be a franchise of real or tenant property or any other kind, restricting them beyond what they had in the past in the way of an electoral franchise. I desire to point out the difference between the franchise as it exists under this Bill, and the franchise as it exists at this moment in the different provinces, and then to say a word or two in reference to those which have been added. The franchise as it exists at present in the various provinces, I had put some time ago in the shape of a memorandum which is as follows: in Ontario an elector must be a British subject, of age, assessed for real property as owner, tenant or occupant of the following value:—

In cities $400, or be assessed for income of not less than $400.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Not now.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It has been altered since this memorandum was drawn up. They may alter it from day to day if they choose, and I believe they do.

HON. MR. SCOTT—It was amended at the last session of the Legislature.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It was altered in anticipation of a Dominion Franchise Bill, in order to embarrass us a little.

HON. MR. SCOTT—It is not now the law of Ontario.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It has been so far as elections up to now are concerned. The last alteration is that in towns he must be possessed of real property of the value of $300; in villages $200; in townships $200. That is the last alteration which they have made in Ontario, and the interruption of my hon. friend opposite suggests to me one of the

strongest reasons, which I omitted when I was referring to the point, for the passage of this Bill and the establishment of a franchise which shall be firm and lasting with reference to members of the House of Commons and it is this ; that they are altering perpetually the franchise law in Ontario and in some of the other provinces, and I think I may safely say without fear of successful contradiction that those alterations or some of them have been made for the very purpose of having influence upon the elections of the House of Commons. They have been altered at times, and so abruptly, and in the immediate presence of an election for the House of Commons, that one cannot but believe that they are altered for the purpose of influencing that election, and that has been done in other provinces besides Ontario. It has been a subject of remark, and has suggested to members of the House of Commons and to members of the Government, and no doubt to many members of this House, that the only way of getting over a great evil of the kind was to take the franchise into our own hands, and create such a franchise as we thought proper for the House of Commons, a constituent part of this Parliament. I have stated to you the franchise which exists in Ontario. In Quebec the real property qualification in cities is $300, and elsewhere $200 : or $20 annual value, or a tenant paying annual rent for real estate in cities of $30—elsewhere $20 : provided the real estate itself be rated at $300 and $200 respectively. In New Brunswick he must be assessed for real estate to the value of $100. Personal estate, or real and personal estate together to the value of $400, or have an income of $400.

HON. MR. POWER—It has been altered there.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It has been altered there, and changed back again.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, to meet an election in the House of Commons. In British Columbia the franchise is universal suffrage. In Manitoba the owner of real estate to the value of $100, or tenant of real estate of value $200, and rent of $20. per annum, or occupant and householder of land to the annual value of $20. In Nova Scotia real estate to the value of $150, or personal estate or real and personal estate together to the value of $300. In Prince Edward Island, residence for one year, and being on the voters' list and paying a poll tax for the year preceding ; or he must for 12 months preceding revision of voters' list have owned, or been entitled to a freehold estate of clear yearly value of $6.40, or to one whole water lot, common lot, town lot or pasture lot within the town of Georgetown or Charlottetown, etc.

Now the provisions of this Bill are : in cities he must be the owner of an estate to the actual value of $300. Hon. gentlemen will see that it was $400 in Ontario, $300 in Quebec, and $200 in some of the other Provinces. We have taken the mean sum of $300 in cities, and in towns $200 ; or as tenant at a monthly rental of at least $2, or a quarterly rental of at least $6, or half yearly rental of at least $12, or an annual rental of at least $20, and whose last year's rent has been paid ; or as occupant of real property, if in a city, under an agreement to purchase from the Crown or any other person or corporation, or occupies in any other manner, except as owner or tenant, property to the value of $300, and in towns $200. Then copied from some of the Provinces the vote given to the following persons, having an income of $300 annually from his earning or from some investment, and residence in cities or towns : in counties he shall be entitled to a vote if he is the owner of real property of the actual value of $150 ; that again varies somewhat from what is now the case, and it varies in some provinces augmenting it, and in other provinces diminishing it. In New Brunswick real estate to the value of $100 would now give a vote ; whereas we require a value of $150. Then a tenant must be under lease at a monthly rental of at least $20 a year, and has really and bona fide paid one year's rent for such real property at not less than that rate, or if an occupant, if he is the bona fide occupant of real property to the value of $150, whether such occupation be under license or agreement to purchase from the Crown or any other way. There is also a vote given to the possessor of an income in the country of not less than $300. The vote is also

given to fishermen, and I was very glad to see that, and I hope it will recommend itself to the favorable consideration of those gentlemen who are from the Maritime Provinces—fishermen owning real property and boats and net and fishing gear and tackle which, together, are of the actual value of $150. Then the vote is given to farmers' sons and to the sons of other persons entitled to vote under similar provision in the Ontario franchise. Then after giving all those persons votes there is a restrictive clause saying who shall not vote at elections, and amongst others who are disqualified are the Indians in Manitoba, British Columbia, Keewatin and the North-West Territories, and any Indian on any reserve elsewhere in Canada who is not in possession and occupation of a separate and distinct tract of land of the value of at least $150, and who is not otherwise possessed of the qualifications entitling him to be registered on the list of voters. Great opposition was raised to this provision about Indians in the other branch of the Legislature. It seems to me a most unjust one. I know something of the Indians in Tyendinaga, which is a township on the confines of a constituency that I once represented, and where I knew the Indians somewhat intimately, and I know from what I saw of them in their domestic life that many of them were as well qualified to vote as white men. Many of them were men possessed of considerable amount of property; could read and write, and were as intelligent, and were quite as entitled to vote, as many of their white neighbors. The restriction here is that the Indian although on the reserve; must be possessed of a separate and distinct tract of land either on the reserve or elsewhere. It seems to me that it is the height of absurdity to deny those people votes. They were here before we were here; they were the owners of the country before we were, have always been loyal to the Crown, and they are educated, some of them perfectly educated—I know one of them a member of Oxford University, and there are lots of them educated at the common schools of the country, and are as well educated as the children of white people. The objection taken is that they are wards of the Crown, and as such are likely to be influenced by the Government. They are not wards of the Crown in the sense that the crown can deprive them of anything. There is no sort of influence that the Crown can exercise upon them that I know of to induce them to vote one way or the other. They are just as free as any other class of Her Majesty's subjects and it seems to me, are just as entitled to vote as any other class of Her Majesty's subjects. I have informed the House what the provision of the Bill is as to registration of voters and revising barristers; but it would perhaps be convenient that I should mention to the House the provision of the Bill for the beginning of the voters' list, a provision which attracted a great deal of attention in the Lower House, and which was somewhat altered, but is now presented in principle to a large extent as it stood originally. The revising officer who prepares the first list of voters shall obtain a certified copy of the last revise or final assessment roll of the district and also certified copy of the last revised list of voters, and that voters' list having been supplied by him shall be communicated to those who are chiefly interested, in a variety of ways pointed out by the Bill, and then there shall be a revision when people can be heard for or against the list as it stood, after which there is a final settlement of the voters' list. I do not know that any body could suggest a better way of correcting an original list. You are to take the list that was voted on at the last election. You revise that list, and your revision is subject to appeal. You are obliged to send it to the persons interested, to each member of the Councill of every city, town, township or village in the electoral district, to the clerk and treasurer, to each postmaster in every municipality or polling division; to the sheriff, warden, clerk of the Peace and county Judge and to the unsuccessful candidate at the last election, and every suggestion to make the thing public, and bring to bear upon it the light which public opinion throws upon all things of the kind, and which enforces fairness and reasonable decisions and reasonable actions upon the part of those who have to deal with the matter, is here adopted. These are the general provisions of the bill which has received the sanction of the House of Commons who are chiefly interested in it,

and which is now presented to you for your consideration. I am happy to believe that it is one which presents to the country an increased liberality as regard those who are entitled to vote. It gives votes to those who have a small interest in the country, that interest being a permanent one. All those things tend to permanency, and to restrict the right to vote to those men who have a real and lasting interest in the country, and to such we should all be willing to give votes. Of course I feel that in lowering the franchise it may possibly be that some are included, and some may get votes who are not of the class that we would like to see enfranchised; but I think they would be the exception, and that such instances will be few in the country, and they will not be sufficiently numerous to influence by their votes, the position of those who are, for the time being, entrusted with the Government of the country. I submit the Bill to the House with every hope that it will receive your favorable consideration.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The Minister of Justice, in submitting this bill for our consideration, prefaced his remarks with the usual frank and candid expression of his own views which indicate the fair-minded man. He told us there were two opinions as to the franchise which ought to be proposed to the Parliament of Canada. This is evidently not the bill that, had the subject matter been left exclusively to himself, he would have framed for our consideration. He spoke rather favorably of giving to the Provincial authorities at least the right of arranging the list, and of continuing, as far as possible, the system that has already existed, saving and excepting, perhaps, the question of uniformity of franchise. He stated that at the time of Confederation a provision was introduced in the British North America Act providing that when the Parliament of Canada saw fit to establish a uniform franchise for the Dominion it should do so. Now, I quite understand the reasonableness of that proposition, and if the franchise that is submitted to us to-day were in harmony with the view then taken by the promoters of the British North America Act, I should not raise my voice against it. They, no doubt, had in view the franchise that was in operation in the only two provinces then united, Upper and Lower Canada. Under that franchise there was uniformity, no doubt, but the preparation of the lists, the filing of the papers, the whole arrangement of these details was relegated to the municipal authorities. The Parliament of Old Canada simply provided that the franchise should be a certain and definite sum, the mode of arriving at which was through the different municipal institutions that prevailed in the provinces. We know that the municipal institutions of Upper and Lower Canada were not alike, and had this Bill followed those lines I should have seen no objection whatever to it, but because it is a departure from the principle which then existed and which I think the promoters of the British North America Act had in view when framing it, I am disposed to question the fairness and the justice of the measure submitted to us. In the first place, I do not think it can be argued that the change has become necessary. The hon. gentleman has endeavored to make it appear that the Province of Ontario was so intent on affecting the election of members to the House of Commons that they altered their franchise on the eve of elections for the Parliament of Canada. I deny that *in toto*. If anyone looks at the system in Ontario it will be seen that it has been a broadening and widening system, giving the franchise to larger numbers as the changes were made, increasing the number of those who had a right to vote for members of the Local Legislature and of the Dominion House of Commons. Certainly there has been no agitation in any part of Canada against the franchise which has been exercised now since Confederation, nearly 20 years. No petitions have been presented against it, there has been no exhibition of public feeling in favor of a change, and it does appear to me that the Conservative party have very little right to complain. There have been five elections since Confederation and they have had four of them. In the last two elections they have had very considerable majorities, in the last one, I believe, a majority in all the Provinces. It cannot, therefore, be that the system in operation has worked injuriously to their interests. That is obvious. Do they feel

that it is necessary to entirely block out the Liberal party from any participation in the administration of public affairs—to deprive them of that one-fifth chance they have had to govern the country for the last 20 years? It would appear so from the measure which was submitted in the other Chamber, the object of which was to secure the majority in their seats in the House of Commons. That was the object, as clearly as any measure could have an object. The hon. gentleman has commented on the time that has been spent in the debate on this Bill in another place. It is fortunate for the country that there was a patriotic body, if weak in numbers yet strong in patriotism, who during those seven weeks battled with the Bill as introduced by the Government, and succeeded in striking out many obnoxious clauses. They were unable to make it a fair and reasonable Bill, it is true, but many portions of that measure, for which no possible defence could be urged, which it was not possible to justify, were stricken out in the various stages that were taken in the long period it was under discussion. It was a fight for political life by the Opposition in the other Chamber, because the Bill, as submitted by the Government, meant giving for all time to come the right of being elected to the Conservative party. Practically it made the revising barrister the absolute arbiter and judge of who should be on that list, and who should not. It gave him powers without appeal: it allowed him to make out the list of his own mere motion: it allowed him to override the assessment roll; he was not bound by the valuation of the assessors; it gave to the tribal Indians the right to vote. Very many important changes have been made in the clauses to which I have referred in its passage through the lower House. As we all know, there may be a divided opinion as to woman suffrage, but the Bill as brought down gave to widows and unmarried women the right to vote. The Chinese were given the right to vote, though they were at a subsequent stage disfranchised. The revising barrister cannot now be a candidate. As the Bill stood, and as it was pressed upon the House of Commons, the revising barrister had only to make up his lists and, having completed them, if an election came on he was an eligible candidate. He could have that in view at the very time he framed those lists, and he had the power to add names to the list at his own mere motion. He did not require the suggestion of any outsider; he could take the list into his own private room and put on or take off the names of any he pleased, and that power can be best appreciated by the fact that for the first time in this Dominion the vote is largely increased by the addition of farmers' sons, wage earners, and those having a vote under the income clause—all those are to be put on. It rested with the revising barrister to say whom he should select of those, because it was a matter of discretion whether a farmer having a farm of 500 acres, and two sons should give his two sons the votes or not. It gave, as I said before, the right to refuse an appeal from his decision. All that, fortunately, has been changed. The Bill, no doubt, has been broadened in its operation. The franchise in towns has been reduced, since the Bill was brought in, from $300 to $200, and also in the case of occupants to some extent. The income franchise has been reduced from $400 to $300. In the matter of appeals, very large and important changes have been made, giving some sort of security against the decision of the revising barrister, and also giving increased publicity. As first proposed, the time within which those lists were absolutely confirmed and parties absolutely shut off from appeal, was much shorter than it is now; it was originally two weeks; it has now been enlarged to four weeks, and in some instances to six weeks. Those were the prominent changes in the Bill, and they were important modifications that were gained by the stubborn fight to which Her Majesty's loyal Opposition were obliged to resort in order to secure an appearance of fairness in this measure.

I come now to the principal objection to this Bill: that is, that it is going to create very great confusion throughout the whole Dominion. In no respect is it similar to the franchise in any one of the provinces. In some provinces, as the hon. gentleman explained, the franchise is higher: in some it is lower. Its object apparently was to obtain uniformity, yet when British Columbia and Prince Edward

Island insisted on being omitted, they were let out, so that all those who have been in the habit of voting in those two provinces in the past will have the right to vote in future. It cannot be contended therefore that uniformity has been secured so far as these two provinces are concerned. The hon. gentleman justified the Indian vote by the legislation in Ontario. The Indian vote as permitted in the province of Ontario by the new Bill is reasonable ; had the Government here taken that as an example I should have no objection to it. In Ontario an Indian, in order to vote, must hold land on which he pays taxes—land entirely apart from the Government reserve. It is a matter of notoriety, and the hon. gentleman's experience with Indians all over this Dominion must have convinced him of the truth of what I say, that the Indian, as a rule, is not educated in the politics of the country. He pays no taxes : the very basis of representation is paying taxes. Does it not seem preposterous that a man who pays taxes, who is a pensioner of the nation—

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Oh no ; he is not a pensioner ; he is drawing money that belongs to his tribe.

HON. MR. SCOTT—We set apart a reserve for the Indians and undertake to pay them so many dollars a year, but we do not regard them as ordinary citizens because we do not collect taxes from them. We protect them in many ways. We do not permit liquor to be sold to them—we are not so careful of white men as we are of the Indians—and there are strong penal laws for selling liquor to them.

HON. MR. PLUMB—You have made the same provision for white men in some parts of the country.

HON. MR. SCOTT—We know from reading reports of the Indian Department year by year that the Indians ask the Government for advances of seed. They are improvident, as we all know, and omit saving seed for their farms and advances have to be made to them. Everybody knows that the Indian agent is all powerful with the tribe ; that when land has to be sold for a railway, or any other purpose, or if a person wants to purchase a part of an Indian reserve, it has all to be done through the agent. He calls the tribe together, and is their guide. It is the agent who would direct the Indians how to vote. The hon. gentleman says there are some graduates of Oxford among the Indians. I believe there is one Indian who is a graduate of Oxford, and this one is brought forward as a typical Indian. We know that is not the condition of the Indians. They wander over this country seeking whiskey where they can get it—they are poor, wandering and begging people. The Indians have never asked for the franchise ; who suggested it? Whoever heard that they required it? Is there a gentleman in this Chamber who ever heard, during the last five years, of pressure being brought, on the part of the Indians, upon the Government to give them the right to vote? Is it not extraordinary to make those fundamental changes in our constitution—because they are fundamental changes, they will change in some parts of the country the whole franchise—in order to give the Indian a vote? By whom will the vote be controlled but by the agent, and who appoints the agent? The Government of the day. Those Indians are being rapidly educated, no doubt : they are being educated now into the mysteries of a Conservative society. They are being made Orangemen, with a view of educating them up to a political level. That, no doubt, was the great inducement of the Conservative party to give them the right to vote. They were being educated up as Orangemen, and as Orangemen they would be all swept in to vote for the Conservative candidates on the day of election—the agent being their guide. My hon. friend knows very well that this is the case—that halls which are paid for out of the public money for the Indians are being used throughout Ontario as Orange lodges.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No. I never heard of it before.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I do not know that my hon. friend can give the password, but he should be aware of it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, I never heard of it.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Here is the organ of the Orange body, the *Orange Sentinel*, published in Toronto. It seems up at Moraviantown, an Indian village, there is an Orange Lodge. This is what the *Sentinel* says in its issue of April 30th :—

"W. Bro. Hugh Gallagher, District Master, District No. 2, Co. Kent, writes as follows :—I made a visit to Moraviantown (Indian) Lodge No. 543, at their regular monthly meeting last Monday evening, a week ago, and am happy to say the lodge has every appearance of being a grand success. I think the warrant is in first-class hands. There is a determination amongst the members that none but good men and true shall be admitted to membership, and one and all take the most lively interest in the working of the lodge, and are anxious to carry on their work strictly in accordance with the constitution and the principles of Orangeism."

HON SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Is not that all right?

HON. MR. SCOTT—I say that is the preface to their political education. Having become Orangemen they are fit for voting.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It shows that they are intelligent men.

HON. MR. SCOTT—And Orange lodges have been established elsewhere on the reserves.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Why not?

HON. MR. SCOTT—I suppose, that being done, the next step is to enfranchise them; but it seems to me a departure from the fundamental principles on which governments are carried on that those who pay no taxes, who are looked after and protected just as much as the inmates of an asylum, should be entitled to vote, and on the flimsy pretext that they are occupying a hut and land on the reserve worth $150. All that the revising barrister has to do is to ascertain that they are all good true Conservatives and then he puts them on the voters' list. They all live in their individual wigwams and huts no doubt.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Many of them have good houses.

HON. MR. SCOTT—No doubt some of them are worth $150, but the property is not theirs; they cannot sell it, because it belongs to the tribe. It is a reserve, just as much as these buildings are reserved, and they should have no more right to vote upon the property in the reserve than one of our servants should have to attempt to vote on this building. The Indian who wants to vote, and has this house and plot of ground around it, on which he grows potatoes and a little corn, can have it valued at $150 by the revising barrister; the Indian has no control over it. He could not sell it and he pays no taxes.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I know lots of cases where they lease it.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The individual Indian has no right to lease his land.

HON. MR. PLUMB—He has a right and I will prove it in good time.

HON MR. SCOTT—I dare say it is not pleasant information to be conveyed to the country, but, nevertheless, it is true. The Government should have followed the plan adopted in Ontario; where the Indian acquires land of his own and pays taxes, he votes—I say that that Indian has earned the right to be a voter just as the white man has earned the right when he has by industry acquired a little holding worth the amount that we fix as the limit of the franchise; but you are giving the Indian an advantage over the white man: you deny the wage earner, who is of value in the community, and is earning $200 a year, a right to vote, though he contributes to our expenses here, though he pays taxes and consumes dutiable goods largely; but you give the vote to the Indian who contributes no taxes whatever, who has no municipal obligations of any kind, who cannot be called upon to be a juror, and is not regarded as one of the community, who is isolated from all the rest of the country—that is the man whose vote you think ought to be put in juxtaposition with the vote of an intelligent white man, who is contributing to the revenue of the country and paying municipal taxes in the community in which he lives. The hon. gentleman attempted to justify the revising barrister by reference

to what has been done in England. It is an unfortunate reference, because we all know very well that the revising barrister there is appointed in the country districts —at all events outside of London—by the judge on circuit; that he is only appointed *pro tem*, and that these barristers are selected promiscuously by judges of standing, and owe their appointment, not to the Government of the day, but to their own honesty, integrity and standing at the bar. But how is it with the revising barrister here? The hon. gentleman passed some high encomiums upon the members of the bar. I am quite willing to accord all that he said of them, but do you mean to tell me that where you appoint a man for the purpose of framing a list on which members of Parliament are to be elected, the Government will fail to select warm political friends—that they will give offices away to those who are lukewarm, indifferent or opposed to them? No, we are all conscious of the fact that all Governments do differently, and certainly this Government would be extremely slow to appoint anybody who is not in political sympathy with them to an office of that kind. The officer would know very well from the beginning why he was appointed. He would know that it was because he was expected to make the lists for his friends (Oh, oh, oh!) Hon. gentlemen may say "oh, oh, oh?" but from an impartial standpoint that is the conclusion. If my hon. friend would take an independent view of this subject he would agree with me. He states that, to make the revising barrister independent of improper influence, he is appointed for life—that is to say, if by accident the Grits got in, you cannot turn him out and he will prepare the lists to suit his friends.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The man would do his duty, I suppose.

HON. MR. SCOTT — The House knows very well that in many parts of the Dominion the elections are very warmly contested: that the members in many counties are elected by majorities within a hundred. At one election a Reformer is elected, at another a Conservative. In many the majority is often less than 100 —there are many in which the successful candidate is elected by a majority of 20 or 25 votes. It is idle to discuss the subject on an other basis than that the revising barrister is there to aid the Government, and do you mean to tell me that, without being open to the charge of manipulating the roll, he could not make that difference in the number either one way or the other? He has a right to name anyone he pleases. You say that every voter has a right to appeal. Take the case of a farmer and his sons. The barrister asks, "What is the value of your property?" He replies "$500." The farmer is asked "How many sons have you?" He replies "three." If they are political friends of the Government the revising barrister puts them on the list—he puts them on at the instance of his political friends. Will he do the same on the other side if it is not established by indubitable evidence that the voters have a right to be there? The Reformer and his sons must prove their case, and even then the barrister is not bound by it. He has every possible advantage; but as a matter of fact we know how these things are usually done. We know that people are slow, except under the exitement and pressure of an election, to be bothered with the lists. The revising barrister makes his list in his office; he gives formal notice, but many a man will say "there will be no election this year; I will let it go." Nobody takes any interest in the list, and unless an election is to be fought in the revising barrister's office and an excitement is got up—unless people are called in from all parts of the country and information is obtained to find out the true facts of the case whether John Brown and his three sons are on that roll properly, or whether John Brown's property warrants that they should be on the roll, who is going to inquire into it? Nobody will take the trouble. There is where the party in power have the advantage, I say, owing to the inertness of the mass of the people at the time these lists are being made up. Unless each political party name counsel to look after it and have commissioners and employ very much the same machinery that they have before general election, I say these lists will be neglected. It is idle to talk about outsiders (because the Liberal party are the outsiders on this occasion) getting fair

play without an appeal. They cannot get fair play unless they appeal, and there will be no appeal in most cases; the lists will go by default and it will be found, when too late, that the dice have been loaded and there is not a fair representation of the people. There is no subject on which people are more sensitive and tender than this question of fair play at the elections. It does seem monstrous that the Government should avail itself of its numerical influence to frame a bill of this kind to give it such an immense advantage in the general election. It would seem as if before a general election some scheme had to be adopted to keep the Government in power. How was it in 1882? Members were told to arrange their counties, to lop off a township here and put on one there, and where possible to "hive the Grits," as the expression got to be recognized, and it was a true saying. Where there was 90 per cent. of Grits, they were gathered together, roped into one constituency, and their influence taken from the surrounding constituencies. By that means, the present Government secured their majority. Is that dodge going to fail, or are the people indignant that a trick was played on them, and the municipalities were broken up in Ontario merely for the purpose of securing a Conservative majority from that province, and this measure is to be adopted merely because that will not work a second time? Is it because the people are being educated to what is going on, and will not permit themselves to be grouped together to support or reject certain principles, that recourse must be had to this device? Certainly in no free country would a measure of that kind be tolerated, because people living under free governments are sensitive in that, above all things, and we ought to see that, as between the two political parties, when you come to place them before the tribunal of public opinion, each party is on equal ground and there is no disadvantage on either side. The Government of the day, particularly, a Government that have been in office three-fourths of the time since Confederation, that have appointed a great majority of the officials in the country, that have had the opportunity of carrying on great public works and strengthening themselves in every way, should not require to bolster up their position at a new election. It does seem to me that it is asking more than is reasonable and fair. The Government of the day have all the advantages which attend the possession of power, and they are not satisfied with the advantages which circumstances—circumstances that are fair and reasonable—have given them. They find it necessary to introduce the revising barrister into the arena in order to strengthen them in the several constituencies—because, argue it as you may, the revising barrister would be an angel if he had no political feeling. If he were receiving an amount large enough to make him independent of any influence I could understand that he would cease to be a partizan. We know how gentlemen, when appointed here, lose their political proclivities—become perfectly independent—and, no doubt if the revising barrister were paid $4,000 a year he would become independent, as the Senators are; but the revising barrister is to receive a limited amount—seven, eight, nine hundred dollars a year—I cannot say what the Government will give him—but, at all events, it can only be a fee, not a permanent remuneration on which he is going to live. Nobody pretends to say that he will receive from the Government sufficient to support him; he is to be paid for special work, in the same way as counsel who are employed in an arbitration, or to do any special work. To that extent only is the revising barrister an independent agent. He still acts with his party and is one of them. He is not the same as a judge who receives an emolument which removes him from the political arena altogether. He will receive a comparatively small sum, and therefore will be an active agent of the party; and will anybody pretend to say that it will not be the voters who are reliable friends of the Government who will be appointed revising barristers? We all know very well that it is the natural tendency of all Governments to appoint their friends. I do not say that this Government would do so to a greater degree than any other Government, but we know that the patronage is exercised by the friends of the Government and therefore the revising barrister would be an angel, as I said before——

HON. MR. ALMON—Who ever heard of one being a barrister?

HON. MR. SCOTT—I think a revising barrister is an occupation that an angel would not like to take. There are, of course, a great many other objectionable clauses in the Bill to which I will call attention, perhaps, at a later stage. At present I content myself with pointing out those glaring instances in which the Bill is manifestly unfair and unjust, where it places one political party at serious disadvantage. If I had given no other illustrations than the two or three I have mentioned, they would be sufficient to warrant the House in coming to the conclusion that it is not a reasonable or fair bill as between the two parties. Does my hon. friend mean to say that either Lord Salisbury or Mr Gladstone would introduce such a bill in the British House of Commons?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, I think if they were well advised, they would.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I think not. They had a distribution bill there as my hon. friend knows, and if he will read the Conservative reviews on the fairness of that distribution, he will find a marked contrast between the re-distribution there and the one here in 1882.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Do you mean Mr. Mowat's last distribution?

HON. MR. SCOTT—No, I am talking now of the re-distribution by the Parliament of Canada of the constituencies in 1882. Mr. Mowat's re-distribution is one on which we can challenge the hon. gentleman's criticism at any time. That distribution did not break up any boundaries at all.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Oh, yes it did.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The distribution bill of 1882 broke up some counties altogether. It took two or three townships from one, and two or three from another and joined them together to form a constituency. There is just the same difference between the two that there is between Mr. Mowat's provision respecting Indians and the provisions in this bill on the same subject. As I have explained, Mr. Mowat gives the Indian a right to vote when he becomes a tax-payer and is assessed for land like the white man, and steps outside of the dependent position which, naturally, he occupies as a ward of the Government of Canada. Now I think if this House will recognize fair dealing between parties, as they do when commercial interests are under consideration, then I believe they will not be disposed to pass this Bill. We must remember there have been no substantial grounds for fault-finding with the franchise, which has up to the present time been in force since Confederation. If any change should be made it ought to be in the direction of establishing a uniform franchise, to be carried out, the lists to be made, and all the machinery to be arranged by the municipal authorities. We are now stepping in and taking from the people a privilege that they have heretofore enjoyed, of saying who shall vote and how the lists shall be arranged. I have never heard of any charge, or seen it discussed, even in the party papers, that any unfairness had arisen from the present system in the past. It cannot be said that there is no unfairness under this proposed system, because the Government, in appealing to the people upon lists prepared by their own friends, practically name the tribunal before which they are to answer to the people of Canada when they go to the polls on the next occasion. It is for these reasons, and because the Bill is so objectionable to, at all events, a large minority, if not a majority of the people of the country, that I wish to take the sense of this House on the second reading. I therefore move that the Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I much regret that I feel bound to oppose this measure. No doubt a public man must have very strong reasons before he can honorably separate from his political friends, from those under whose leadership he has fought the battles of his country year after year, and I go so far as to say that in case of doubt, such a politician should give his leaders the benefit of any

doubts which may exist in his mind. This I have done always, and would be ready to do now, if I could be persuaded that there are any doubts as to the good or evil results of such a measure as this which is now proposed for the consideration of this honorable body. But there can exist no such doubts in my mind; on the contrary it seems to me evident that the very principle of this Franchise Bill is a bad one: one far from being in any way conservative, its tendency being altogether towards universal suffrage—a principle which I consider, in all cases, a most wretched one, but especially so when considered as being proposed to be applied to this country, and I regret to say that this is not the first step which has been made in that direction. I remember I had occasion in 1874 to call the attention of hon. members to a measure which had the same tendency, when it was proposed to do away with the property qualification for members of the House of Commons. I opposed the scheme then, but Parliament adopted it. My reasons for opposing it was that it was the first step in the direction of universal suffrage, and I predicted then that it would, no doubt, be followed by another step in the same direction, probably at a not far distant day. Such a franchise, I considered then, would be against the best interests of the country at large, and contrary to the well understood interests of the French minority in the Dominion of Canada in particular. My views have not changed since then; on the contrary, I feel now that I was right and that I ought not to alter my views, but should stick to them. This will explain the stand I propose to take in the present instance. In support of my views, and as proof of the logical standpoint I take on this measure, I will take the liberty of quoting from a Conservative journal, and a Government organ, the following: The Montreal *Gazette* of the 26th ultimo, says:—

"All things considered, the proposition in favor of manhood suffrage, received a very fair measure of support in the House of Commons.

"The other principle, that of property qualification has up to this time been the basis of franchise in Canada, although in latter years in accordance with the axiom, that representation and taxation should go hand in hand, an income qualification has been established in those provinces in which income is taxable.

"Taxation is the true basis of the suffrage, every man who contributes to the cost of government ought to exercise a vote.

"Manhood suffrage, with registration, need not be dreaded by any class of people. It will come sooner or later, and judging by the liberality of the Bill now before Parliament, is already well-nigh reached.

"The Franchise Bill now before Parliament is a long step towards it—manhood suffrage."

Another journal on the Government side, the Montreal *Herald* of the 27th ultimo, says:—

"We agree with the *Gazette* in its position that every one who contributes to the cost of Government ought to exercise a vote.

"We are glad to notice that the *Gazette* is fully committed to manhood suffrage, which it says must be conceded by Parliament in a in a few years.

"This is what the *Herald* has all along maintained, and we are surprised to find such hesitation in the Government ranks in regard to the frank concession of a right which will yet be wrested from Parliament, in spite of the real "Tories" who are handicapping the Conservative party in its race with its opponents.

"Manhood suffrage stands to-day as the one comprehensive measure by the adoption of which the sins of the party can be wiped out, and its claims to lead in all progressive measures maintained."

The arguments brought forth by the writers of these articles are wholly based on what they improperly call an axiom. They say "Taxation is the true basis of the suffrage." If so, why then are Indians, who pay no taxes, given a vote? This proposition is much less an axiom than is this other: "Property is the true basis of suffrage." Indeed, it is a rule which is much less sure and certainly, for a new country, it is a dangerous one. As a matter of general principle and of sound basis for suffrage in a country like this, an agricultural country, it seems desirable that the only truly interested parties in the welfare of of the country ought to have a voice in its administration. Who are those, if not the holders of the soil? All others must necessarily have less interest in its good government. They necessarily must be less anxious for the successful working of its institutions. They have left their native land to find a better living, and until they succeed they will not be quiet. If they do not meet with sufficient success here amongst us, they will go elsewhere. They have nothing to attach them to this part of the world more than to any other.

Where their efforts will be crowned with better success they will stay. If amongst us in Canada they find their desires fulfilled; if they meet with success here and are satisfied, they soon will be holders of the soil, and become really interested in the good government of this their adopted country. If it be so; if the basis of the project under consideration is a long step towards "universal suffrage," then it is practically "universal suffrage," a principle which not only is not conservative, but which is not even a principle which many Liberals would acknowledge. Indeed, it is a radical change which I am astonished that the leaders of the Conservative party could have entertained, and should have tried to impose on their followers.

I have already said that a party man is bound to stand by his leaders; he ought not to refuse, or even hesitate, to give them his support, except in very exceptional cases. But while such are the duties of the rank and file of a party, it is far more the duty of a leader to stand by the principles of his party: such a duty being a logical consequence of the obligations of his followers towards him. He has no right to change or abandon the principles which he has been chosen to maintain, and for the triumph of which he has promised to do his utmost. He has been selected to carry the standard of the party. To the principles which this standard represents, he must be true and devoted. Failing in that his supporters are free. They have a right, nay it is their duty to refuse to follow him out of the way and they are bound to stand by their principles.

I was born a Conservative; I have lived a Conservative. How could I then accept a measure such as that which is now submitted to this House? No doubt, in this 19th century, when principles, it seems, are so very little cared for throughout the whole universe, our Canadian society cannot be presumed to be altogether free from such an evil, and sincere politicians have sometimes a difficult task before them. They have now and then to accept such legislation as is not quite sound. They have often to take the best out of two propositions when both do not meet their views, but to pass from conservative principles to radical and revolutionary ideas is rather too much, and I am surprised that the Government could have met in the present instance with such success as they have achieved with the representatives of the people in another part of these buildings.

In view of these facts I am at a loss to understand how it is that there is a Conservative party and a Liberal party, when we Conservatives are ready to go as far, indeed further than moderate Liberals are willing to advance. Why not then be united, since such principles as have separated us into two camps, exist no more?

Another objection to this Bill is its tendency towards centralization. No doubt this Parliament has full power to pass such a measure. The British North America Act leaves no doubt on this matter, but the 41st clause giving such power is permissive and no more imperative than is the 25th clause of the same Act, which provides that "The Queen may appoint three or six 'Senators' over the number allowed as the ordinary representatives of the Dominion in the Senate.'" Yet who ever thought of using this last privilege before it became an imperative necessity to do so? So in the present instance, that of the Franchise Bill, such a centralization principle ought not to be adopted before it became an absolute necessity. No doubt it was wise to give power to this Parliament to legislate on the franchise; just as much as it was to provide for the appointment of extra Senators, but because this Parliament has such power, it does not follow that it must be made use of before it becomes absolutely necessary, or there are very strong reasons for so doing; any more than the Crown will ever exercise the power to appoint extra Senators, before a deadlock in the Senate makes it necessary for the carrying out of the business of the country. Centralization is not in the interest of the smaller provinces, it will inevitably lead to a legislative union of the present confederated provinces. We have had too much already of similar legislatton, since Confederation. The Senate ought to pause and reflect seriously before it is too late.

The Montreal *Herald* of the 27th ultimo, was good enough to inform its readers that such a suffrage "was needed for the unification and solidarity of the Canadian people," an announcement which will no doubt, be food for reflection to

such members of French origin as may be inclined to give their support to this meaure. As I said before, there can be but one opinion as to the power of this Parliament to deal with this important question. But the question which we have now to consider is, whether such legislation is desirable, whether it is in the best interests of the country, whether it is necessary, as supporters of the Bill assert. I say, without the least hesitation, that it is not. No evidence has been brought to show that it is at all necessary or even desirable. Indeed not one single serious argument has been used which could shew that this measure is at all desirable, while many facts and circumstances fully demonstrate that it is not. No complaint has yet been made against the present state of things—which has been working perfectly well ever since Confederation. Not one single demand has been made by the people to change it. Our population at large, from one end of the Dominion to the other are fully satisfied with it. Each province has carried out its own system, and not one of them has complained. Indeed, how could it have been otherwise when it was left in their own hands to say what franchise they would have, and who should have a right to choose the men to represent their province in the Parliament of their country? What difference could it be to them whether one province had manhood suffrage, while another had property suffrage, and so on for every kind of suffrage? What difference could it make to other provinces, how Quebec should send her sixty-five members to the Commons? Surely no difference. But the fact that such a difference has existed ever since Confederation took place, and that the people are, and have always shown themselves to be perfectly satisfied, is evidence that this proposal of the Government is not in accord with the wishes of the people, and that the forcing of one province to change its suffrage and adopt that of another, as is now proposed, is an arbitrary act which cannot but bring trouble, discontent and dissatisfaction. Until a good case is made out, I unhesitatingly say that it is wrong to change the present system and assimilate the franchise in all the provinces of the Dominion—an assimilation which is no more necessary than that of many other laws of the same kind which can never be assimilated. As an example, the 22nd and 23rd clauses of The British North America Act, providing that senators shall be appointed for the provinces in which they live, and for, their qualification, make an exception as to Quebec senators, and provide that in that province senators shall be appointed for the electoral division in which they live, or in which they hold their property qualification. When that province is made an exception of by the constitutional Act in the case of her representatives in the Senate, to suit the views and principles of the people, why should she not also be an exception in the similar case of her representation in the other branch of Parliament when such a radical change is to be made? It is to be regretted that the representatives of that province in the other branch have not stood by such principles as the late Sir George E. Cartier, himself, maintained and had incorporated in the Union Act of 1867 for the protection of that province in the Dominion. Until a very strong case, supported by irresistible arguments, can be made out, I unhesitatingly say that such a measure is not at all necessary, that it is against the best interest of the country at large, of the smaller provinces particularly, and especially that of Quebec. Two main arguments are advanced by the supporters of this measure; first that the Dominion Parliament has no power over the muncipalities, and, consequently, that the municipal officers or other officials having the custody of the voters' list, might refuse to provide such lists. This seems to me to be a very poor argument, since such officials, municipal or others, are bound to give copies of all such documents. In my own province the 165th article of the Quebec Municipal Code enacts:—

"The Secretary-Treasurer is bound to deliver, upon payment of his fees, to any person applying for the same copies of extracts from any books, rolls, registers, documents or other papers which form part of the archives, &c."

The promoters of the Bill know themselves that such is the case, and that this objection of theirs is not worth much. Indeed the Bill itself enacts that the Revising Barrister shall use the voters' lists of the muicipalities. Why not then

have the Dominion voters' lists made by competent men in the municipalities, men who have a full knowledge of municipal matters, and have such lists, when so made, revised by a commission appointed for such work, and chosen in the county for which such lists are made. Such a system would certainly be more acceptable, and would evidently cost much less, while it would be received with a confidence which the revising barrister will not inspire.

The second objection is the hostility of some of the local legislatures, which may vary the franchise in their province. This objection does not seem to me to be any stronger than the previous one. As I said before, whatever may be the franchise in any one province, it matters very little for the others, provided justice is done to every member of the community in each such province, and provided the views and principles of the majority in each such province, are carried into effect. Then, even if such fears were legitimate, would not such a state of things be much less objectionable than the arbitrary powers given by the present Bill to the revising barristers, who will be better able to abuse them than under the present system, are the municipalities or the Provincial Legislatures. It is further argued that under the present law a farmer, say in Ontario, may probably have no vote while a farmer similarly situated in Quebec would have a vote. No doubt it may be so, but this cannot be prevented; it will also happen under the Bill which is now under consideration. The value of land is not the same throughout the Dominion; it is not even the same throughout a whole province. But of what importance is that, if in each province the people are satisfied with their lot? It is certainly not a reason to impose upon any one province a franchise for which it does not ask, and which is opposed to their principles. Even if it were not evident that the people have no desire for such legislation, that they do not want it, that they seem to be opposed to it, there would be the best reasons to reserve it for a future time, when the finances of the country are in a better position. It cannot be denied that such a system as that proposed by this Bill will be very expensive, and the saving of some thousands of dollars yearly ought not to be disregarded by the politicians of this country. It seems to me that it is not when the country is in so great need of money, when the Government has to face such enormous expenses for our public works, our canals, for the completing of our Pacific Railway —when millions will have to be expended in pacifying the North-West—when our public debt has reached the enormous figure of about $250,000,000, that we ought to indulge in such unnecessary expenses. Such a great increase of our expenses from the public treasury, part of which were unforeseen, foreshadows very heavy taxation on the people of this country. How could these representatives expect to be excused if, by their votes, they were to add such an unnecessary and, let me say, such a comparatively enormous expense as that which the present Bill will impose on the public treasury? I am much mistaken if the adoption of such a law will not be badly received by the people, and if so, who could say they are wrong?

Then, let me add the great expenses which the people throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, will have most probably to bear by the numerous cases of appeal from the decision of the Revising Barrister, which will be the inevitable consequence of this system. Such revising officials, whether judges, lawyers or other professional men, being appointed by the Government, will necessarily create suspicion and uneasiness, and consequently raise grave doubts as to their fairly dealing with the important matter entrusted to their care.

One of the worst features of this Bill is contained in the 13th clause, providing for the appointment of revising barristers. By this clause, the most important powers which, since Confederation, had been left with the people of the different provinces, will be placed in the hands of one single officer of the Government, an officer who will evidently be a creature of the Government of the day, and consequently not quite independent of their influence and of the influence of the Government candidate. It is argued, in answer to this objection, that an appeal will lie against the decision of the revising barrister. Very well, but this only signifies that parties suffering an injustice, or believing that they are, will

have a remedy by an appeal to our courts of law for redress, a fact which is more in the interest of gentlemen at the bar than of those who, in every case, will be the paying parties. This answer, that an appeal will lie, is a poor consolation for those who see great danger in the powers vested in the hands of a single man whose appointment will generally be, or at least probably be, a political one, could politicians lose sight of the fact that a good part of our population are not so well circumstanced that they can waste money for such an object. It might be answered to this that in each party there are men whose interest it will always be to attend to the making of such lists, and who will be ready to bring such cases before the courts at their own expense. This may be true, but what is this, if not opening the door to corrupt practices in our own elections, and helping to demoralize our people? It seems to me that we have already made too much progress in that direction, and that we ought not to go farther but rather step back.

Viewing this enactment from the responsible point of view of a legislator, I candidly admit that I find this feature of the Bill a most dangerous one, one which seems to me to be altogether at variance with all past legislation, and the reverse of sound legislation. Indeed, this measure seems to me to be one which, I regret to say, will call for retaliation at a future, possibly at a not far distant day. It may be said that I take an extreme view of the case. But if the present state of things is taken into consideration, it will be easily seen that it is not so. Indeed, who could have heard for years past the attacks and charges of both political parties against each other—charges which very often were found to be well-founded —who could have been a witness to so many corrupt practices as it has been our lot to hear of—who could recall to mind the many evils of daily occurrence and say that I take an extreme view of the case? No, I regret that it is so, but it is only too true that my appreciation of the present state of things is borne out by the facts.

Such is my honest and conscientious appreciation of this measure. I regret that it has not been possible for me to view it in another light. I regret that I have been forced to the conclusion that it was not a good measure, some parts of it being based on wrong principles. Nevertheless, however bad I may consider it now, as it stands before us in the Senate, I candidly admit that it is somewhat better, by the amendments made to it in the Commons, than it was when it was first submitted to Parliament. It then contained some provisions which I am bound to acknowledge were much worse than those it now contains, such as the clause dealing with woman suffrage. This I regarded as a retrograde step, dangerous and even anti-Christian legislation. Amongst Pagans and Infidels women are not considered much more than brutes. They are kept in a degraded state of slavery. The Reverend J. Watts Lethbridge says that, "under the influence of barbarism woman is regarded as a mere animal, under oriental despotism a plaything for the time." Mrs. Childs in her history of women, says:—

> "The women of Babylon were put up to auction by the public crier, while the magistrates presided over the sales."

Among savage nations woman is still a hewer of wood and a drawer of water, providing by her labour for the daily sustenance and support of her family, while man, abdicating his natural duties, lives in shameful indolence and ease. Such inversion of nature has, as a matter of course, distorted and perverted the disposition of woman who stood in such a condition. Her heart has been literally unstrung, and like a broken musical instrument has completely lost its harmony. Under such circumstances and such a state of things, I can easily understand that women could have deemed it a great privilege to take part in public assemblies. I am not surprised to hear that among the ancient Greeks, where women were kept under very strict discipline, and where they lived quite a retired life, even locked up and guarded, that such women delighted in the exercise of the privilege of voting; but not so with Christian women. Not so, since the long slavery of the fair sex was terminated by the advent of our Blessed Redeemer. No so, since woman has been shown as being equal to man and a companion of man. Not so, since Christ has restored her lost privileges and made known the

important mission which had been entrusted to her since the very beginning, but which had been lost sight of by the perversity of the human race. Let me open the book which contains the laws of Christianity. I will make use of "The Teacher's Bible." My reason for selecting a Protestant book is to show that not only Catholic but also Protestant books are adverse to such a suffrage as that of woman. I find in Genesis Chap. 1st that at the beginning; "God created the first man and created him both male and female." In the 27th Verse, "God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them." Also that out of one of the ribs of the first man God created the first woman whom he gave to man as a companion and a wife. Genesis chap. 1st verse 22: "And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made He a woman and brought her unto the man." "Therefore, shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh." I find that God ordered man to love, honor and protect his wife, while he commanded woman to love, fear and obey her husband. For (says St. Paul to the Ephesians) "the husband is the head of the woman." Further on the Divine Book shows what the mission of both men and women is:—

PROVERBS, Chap. XXXI, Verse 10.—Who can find a virtuous woman, for her price is far above rubies.

12. She seeketh wool and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands.

19. She layeth her hands to the spindle, and her hands hold the distaff.

23. Her husband is known in the gates, when he sitteth among the elders of the land.

24. She maketh fine linen, and selleth it, and delivereth girdles unto the merchant.

26. She openeth her mouth with wisdom; and in her tongue is the law of kindness.

27. She looketh well to the ways of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness.

ST. PETER, 1st Epistle, Chap. III, Verse 1.—Likewise ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands, that, if any obey not the Word, they also may, without the Word, be won by the conversation of the wives.

7. Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife.

ST. PAUL, Ephesians, Chap. V.:—

22. Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord.

23. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church.

24. Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything.

25. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it.

28. He that loveth his wife, loveth himself.

I. ST. PAUL, to Timothy. v. 11. Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.

12. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.

According then to Divine law, in a family well ordained the husband commands while the wife has to obey. "Like every other society, a family is composed of more or less members; like the physical structure each of them is jointed into the socket of another; each one is charged with a distinct office and harmony prevails through a mutual dependence," says the Rev. J. Watts Lethbridge. You cannot then reasonably and legitimately ask for and from woman that which nature and Providence have not qualified her to sustain and perform. Man is charged with a distinct office, so is woman. Harmony will therefore prevail in a family through a mutual dependence. In creation every order of existence is nicely balanced. Take any one part away and there will be a deficiency, insert any new order therein and the thing will be overdone. If woman endeavors to become mannish she produces disgust with all its sad consequences. Woman's heart, head, and hands are not as hard as man's are. Let woman then know her place in society and keep it; let her be educated and qualified for engagements suited to her nature and condition. She has then a right to be protected and respected in the due discharge of the duties of her sex. What would women magistrates, legislators, lawyers, voters, etc., do when they happen to be in the interesting way they like to be? In public, then, man is by nature constituted the head of the woman, and in private life woman is legitimately the glory of man. If women had the franchise granted to them, strange scenes, no doubt, would occur, from the different political tendencies of the husband and the wife, which would recall to mind the proverb, "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

Let then every man remain in his own order, and every woman in her proper

place; let every woman, and, I may add, every legislator, learn a lesson from the past. Let every woman learn there is a possibility of going in for too much and of losing the whole; and, above all, let legislators not allow Christian women to become viragoes, manly or bouncing women, as they will certainly be (and experience shews it is so) if called to take part in public meetings, meddle with politics, and go to the ballot box.

A Protestant writer, the Rev. J Watts Lethbridge, says:—

"When history is well written, the subjective as well as the objective view of the sexes wil be placed before the mind. The subjective is preferred by woman, the objective by man. He glories in the epic she in the lyric side of life. Man fights his country's battles; woman dresses the soldier's wounds. Action is to one what feeling is to the other. Affection and not rule, constitutes woman's power. Those who would bring her upon the platform of public life, do not understand the nature of the being whom they want to thrust forward to the public view. She, the most fearful of animals, suffers most when exposed to the commotions, to the breakers, storms and quicksands of an active, busy, and competing world. Home and the welfare of society fill her heart—home is her palace and family associations the state.

"For the maintenance of order in the State and in the Church, the right persons must occupy the right place. What, then, are the constituent elements of the male and female constitution. Woman, being the more particular or special in her modes of thought and action, is the better adapted by nature and Providence for the select societies of private life. Man looks at the greatest numbers in a general way, whereas woman looks at the individual in a particular way. Man acts from general rules, woman from more special ones. To put woman before the public to preach, lecture, &c., would be to lay upon her a heavier burden than either nature or Providence intended her to bear. Unless the right women, as well as the right men, find and keep their proper places, society must go wrong. To claim for woman, however, the rights of the discharge of public functions, is to take her out of the sphere of womanhood, put an unnecessary and unnatural burthen upon her shoulders, to work with instruments prepared for other hands. She is neither at home amidst active business pursuits, nor scenes of strife, nor the complicated machinery and the turbulent characters which take their place and act their part upon the stage of life. For such affairs she is not qualified, either by education or habit; delicacy of conception and feeling excludes her from actual experience in the affairs of the commercial world; and being excluded from the agencies, impulses, and motives that give direction to the ebbing and flowing of the tides that move along the busy world, she remains in contented ignorance of the manner in which the stirring affairs of business are managed, and occupies separate grounds, as well from her taste and feeling as from her intellectual training. Man can work out the problem of science and woman can build thereupon. The useful and the beautiful always go together in creation, they should keep each other company in society. Man the useful, can lay down the foundation; woman the beautiful can decorate with ornaments of grace the superstructure. One without the other, cannot be made perfect. Her proper and distinctive business is the practical developement of her character in private life, as well as the practical regulation of the home. Scenes of warfare are not her field of glory. Home is her place of action and her throne of state. The enjoyment of woman is centred in her home. And what is it that man seeks in the companionship of woman? A woman to share the home and the one to make the other happy. Woman's promise being distinctly fixed her training must be in harmony with it. Home, with its management is her province, as the world, with its activities belongs to man. He is both educated and instructed for his duties, she must be the same. *Her husband is known in the gates when he sitteth among the elders of the land. She maketh fine linen, and selleth it, and delivereth girdles unto the merchant* —Proverbs, chap. 31.

"Such being the important mission of woman let her not then—even if she be single—be educated for anything else. Let her training be in harmony with it. Let her not be given privileges for which the Great Being who created her, has not prepared her. Let her then, in her early age, be excluded from the agencies, impulses and motives of the busy world. Let her ignore the manner in which the stirring affairs of business and public life are managed. Let her then prepare by proper education to fulfil her mission as the glory of her daily life in the promotion of every good and noble work pertaining to her sex."

Some will say that while we could not allow women to become members of parliament, they ought to be allowed to share the franchise with men, when paying taxes. I have already answered this argument of the "paying of taxes giving a right to vote;" let me only add now, that if this be sound argument, why should not also woman be allowed a seat in parliament, when she has to submit to the laws of her country? Why should she be deprived of the right of supervising from her seat in parliament the expending of the money she pays into the public treasury? Why should she not be allowed to become a lawyer, when she is so often summoned

before our courts and her best interests are at stake? No, hon. gentlemen, such arguments are not sound; they look so at first sight, but they are specious and nothing more, and are generally very easily answered and refuted. It is alleged that there is, in some quarters, a strong feeling in favor of woman suffrage. No doubt such is the case, but I am very far from seeing in such a feeling an evidence of the moral good which the adoption of such a principle would produce. On the contrary, the progress of such ideas elsewhere, and especially in the great republic near to us, has convinced me of the danger of a wrong step in that direction. As it always happens, when people forget the great principles upon which sound legislation ought always to be based, and when innovations are proposed without due consideration, partisans of such ideas cannot help being carried by the logical consequences of their first wrong step, further than they intended at first. So that after having advocated woman suffrage, you will find them advocating the right of women to become lawyers, doctors, preachers, legislators, etc. You have Mrs. Stanton who, advocating before the Committee of the Assembly and the Senate of New York state, the rights of woman, is reported by the New York *Tribune*, as having vindicated for women the right to appear on the hustings.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is aware that under this Bill the suffrage is not extended to women, and therefore his argument is entirely irrelevant to the question before the House? I do not wish to interfere with his speech, but he may not be aware of the fact.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—I am mistaken if on this Bill I am not to discuss the question from every point of view. I have to put my views on record and I am sorry that the hon. gentleman should be instructed to ignore such things.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY—I should like to ask the hon. gentleman what clause of the Bill he is discussing?

The SPEAKER—Very great latitude is allowed in discussing a Bill of this kind, and I do not think the House would be disposed to stop the hon. gentleman in the remarks he is making.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that I am speaking on my own responsibility. I wish to call attention to the fact that there is no clause in this Bill concerning female suffrage, and he is therefore discussing a question which is not before the House.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—I am talking about something that I know, and it is seldom that I have to be called to order. The hon. gentleman may as well make up his mind to listen quietly; I know I am not eloquent, but I have a duty imposed upon me and that duty I will discharge. Then you have Mrs. Dall in her first lecture delivered in Boston in 1861, saying:—

"Dependent upon the *right to labor*, as we have already seen, is *women's civil quality*. If all the fields of human labor are thrown absolutely open, if women enter and grow wealthy therein; if every second woman, for instance, were an intelligent property-holder, is it credible that she, or her husband for her, would remain contented in her present minority—Would she not want a seat in the legislature to protect her property, a vote to control appropriations and taxes."

"How I should rejoice to see a large Lowell mill wholly owned and managed by women! What is to make it possible? Only, that the unoccupied women of wealth and rank, at this moment in the commonwealth, should combine to build or buy such a mill. Suppose it well managed, representing ultimately a million of dollars; Do you believe it would long remain without political power?"

Again, the same lady, in her second lecture at the same place and year, speaking on "Woman's Rights," alluded to the fact that the university-town of Upsal had granted the right of suffrage to women owning real estate and others doing business on their own account; she continues:—

"This is the way the matter is to begin. By-and-by the interests of labor and trade will force the authorities of Bristol and Manchester, Newcastle and Plymouth, to do the same thing, and after women have gone on for some twenty years electing members of parliament, nobody will be surprised to find some women sitting in that body. But, objects somebody, if that ever happens we shall have women on juries, women pleading at the bar, women as attorneys, and so on."

"And this is exactly what we want," adds Miss Dall.

Such are the excesses consequent on a first wrong step, especially in a question of principle. Let us not, then, force women to leave the sphere of womanhood and let the man and woman keep their places according to the views of the Great Being who created both. Such is the view I take of the matter under consideration. Such also are, amongst many others which it would be too long to enumerate, my reasons for abandoning my leaders in the present case. With a question of principle you cannot deal as you could do with other questions. With principles you have to adhere to and stand by them; whereas, where no principle is involved, a party-man is more free to set aside his own views and adopt those of his leaders. Convinced that it was my duty to take such a view of this measure, I thought I was bound to explain my position and give my reasons and my arguments, so that if they could be met, and it could be shown that I was wrong, I might continue my allegiance to my leaders in the present instance, as I have generally done in others, and give them an honest and conscientious support in the passing of this measure. The Hon. Minister of Justice said it would have been easy to leave to Quebec the management of her own franchise; he admitted that such was his opinion. Had the Government done so they would have been carrying out honestly the views of the great leaders of Canada at the time of Confederation, and the view which the hon. member from Ottawa expressed to-day when he said that it was never intended, at the time of Confederation, that such a franchise should be inaugurated in Canada. Sir George Cartier would never have allowed it, and the proof of it is to be found in the Confederation Act, where an exception is made in favor of Quebec on account of her peculiar circumstances, and I am not surprised that a gentleman, so honest as the Minister of Justice has shown himself to be, was himself inclined to give to our province that to which she is entitled, and which was promised at the time of Confederation; but now, by numerical force, by the power of votes, getting them by every means they can, they force Quebec to abandon her principles. I may add that it would be better for the Conservative party in the Dominion not to interfere with Quebec, because there alone sound conservative principles will be found to prevail, thirty, forty, or fifty years hence, if only that province is fairly dealt with. Then the Minister said there was no other way to carry out the provisions of this Bill unless revising barristers were appointed. Any farmer who has a good education could discharge the duty. Such men have made the local lists for eighteen years past; why not pay them so much a year to continue to make them?—$20 or $50 would be sufficient remuneration. Why not appoint a commission of three farmers to revise such lists in each county? As to the confidence which the minister of Justice has expressed in officials, I may tell him that I am far from endorsing his idea. The public service is good but there are exceptions, and if he gives me an inquiry, I say from my seat here to-day that I am prepared to make good my assertion. If so, and it is so even in his own Department, I am justified in refusing revising barristers. We are told to pass this Bill and that honest men will be appointed. As a legislator, sharing a great responsibility for evil or good that will follow the passing of this Bill, and for which some day I will be answerable, I am asked to take such an assurance when I know that so many acts of corruption are perpetrated even in Parliament. This I cannot do when there are so many reasons why I should not feel confidence. I have always worked honestly as a legislator and this I will continue to do. I cannot help it. I suppose I will will have to suffer for it. Never mind, I will do my duty. I am a Conservative and always shall be one, but if every one else in the country becomes a Liberal I will have to choose between two evils. Look at the Montreal *Gazette*? Is there a more Tory paper than that in the country, and yet it is advocating universal suffrage! I will not speak of the *Herald*. It was a Liberal paper at one time. It was bought by persons whose policy it may be not to change too quickly and become Conservative all at once. Am I to be confiding when I see such things under my eyes? I say this Bill is a radical change in our institutions, and I never approve of radical changes. I am sorry

to take up the time of the House, but if I have not succeeded in convincing my hearers, I at all events feel assured that I have done my duty.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

AFTER RECESS.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—The first thought that occurs to me in speaking on this important question is that it is evidently supposed by our friends on the other side that there is no great danger to liberty or to the constitution, from the fact that so few of them are in attendance to watch the progress of this debate.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The country is safe in the hon. gentleman's hands for a time.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—My hon. friend complains a good deal of interruptions when he is speaking, and yet at the very outset of my remarks does himself what he complains of in others. I do not care about it myself; but since he is so sensitive he ought to have a little consideration for others. The leader of the Opposition, no doubt, in his speech to the Senate to-day, has given us all the arguments which can be adduced against the general principles of the Bill which is now before us. I followed his arguments rather closely, and I was surprised to find that after all the objections which have been made throughout the country, after the agitation of which we have heard so much, after the absolute stoppage of the business of Parliament for more than two months and a half in opposing this measure, my hon. friend who has watched the debate from the beginning to the end, and who has a marvellous capacity for seizing the salient points of a controversy, was able to say so little, and that that little was so easily answered. From my hastily taken memoranda I find that his first noticeable remark was a reference to the statement of my hon. friend who sits in front of me, the respected leader of this House, to the effect that he had been at one time of the idea that it might be possible to frame a franchise bill which should crystalize or consolidate the general franchises of the different provinces, and make those franchises permanent. But then of course I have no doubt my hon. friend intended that the Government could apply to any system of that kind their own system of revision, which is a crying evil in this matter, and which it is most important that the Franchise Bill should deal with. As the franchises stood four or five years ago, I confess that I myself had very much the same opinion, but it must be remembered that there has been a constant change of system. The Ontario Government has often altered the franchise, and has changed more particularly the method of dealing with the voters' lists, and the appeals, until the laws on those subjects are in such a maze that it is almost impossible to understand them, or in any way to act under them, except by the aid of counsel, and to my hon. friend, Mr. Bellerose, who spoke to-day of the cost of appeals, I may say it is a very serious matter to have to look after the voters' lists of Ontario, and I know myself the expense of sending to each electoral division some one who is qualified to unravel the intricacies of the law of the Ontario Government, and attempt to deal with the voters' list, and to do justice to the electors of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—It was more than anything else the pressure of the condition of things in that Province that compelled the Conservative Government to adopt a Franchise Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE—Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—I am glad to see my hon. friend take a note of that, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that the Franchise Bill in Ontario was altered twice in one session to suit some possible exigency of the gentlemen who represent the majority in that province. And I can tell the hon. gentleman also that the Franchise Bill which is now in this House, was first drafted nearly three years ago and has been before the people of Canada since that time, and it was understood that it was to be brought forward this year to be pressed to a vote. What did the Ontario Government do in view of that? At the last

session of the legislature of that Province they passed a Bill cutting down the Franchise to a point which they thought would so embarrass the Dominion Government that they could not meet it. They reduced the franchise in such a way that they thought it would be impossible to make what is called a horizontal franchise, suiting Quebec, suiting the other provinces, and yet avoiding the outcry that we had disfranchised some of the voters of Ontario and elsewhere; and the cry has been raised everywhere that we have disfranchised Ontario voters. My hon. friend from Ottawa, (Mr. Scott) was disingenuous enough to use that argument to-day. They have not acted under the new franchise in Ontario as yet. The Bill was passed last session, and it cannot go into operation or effect, so far as the Ontario legislature is concerned, until its term has expired which will be three years hence. That was one of the causes which justified this Government, in self-defence and for the protection of the voters of this country, in order to enable their representatives to sit in the House of Commons upon an equality, to introduce a franchise Bill. The hon. gentleman who was speaking said that everybody was contented with the provincial franchise.

HON. MR. WARK—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I am glad to hear the sound of my respected and hon. friend's voice. He says "hear, hear." If the people of the provinces had been contented with the Franchise Bill does my hon. friend suppose that the large majority of the members of Parliament, after the opposition which has been shown, would have ventured to pass it? Does my hon. friend undertake to say that those gentlemen are not the representatives of the people? The standing argument of my hon. friend opposite me is that we ought not to meddle with questions in which we do not directly represent the people. If the members of the House of Commons do not represent the people who do? They sent this Bill to us, a large majority supported it. When the final vote was taken there was a motion for a three months hoist, and yet after all the agitation, after three months' obstruction of Parliament; after three months of paralysis of public business; after three months of a course which was never pursued before in any legislature in the world; after a course which, had it been commenced in the Democratic Congress of the United States or in Republican France, would have been promptly shut off by a motion for the Previous Question, or the cloture, on the last vote on this Bill, the names of exactly 35 of the gentlemen who were sacrificing themselves for the good of their country will be found recorded. The three-months hoist was moved by a former Minister of the Interior, an active leader of the Opposition, and had the support of the number I state in the House which we are told is representative of public opinion and of the people. I do not intend to follow my hon. friend closely through his speech, but as I do not feel myself bound to defend a Bill of this character which comes up to us from the popular branch, I think that the better way is to take the objections of one who himself poses as a representative of the minority which opposed that Bill in all its stages, and with a very few remarks other than those I shall make in answer to him I shall content myself to-night. He stated, if I understood him correctly, that the framers of confederation had the acceptance of the provincial franchises of their day in view. Now, I think it requires a good deal of courage to make a remark of that kind. It is understood, if anything is understood relative to the subject, that the framers of confederation intended that there should be a uniform franchise for the Dominion Parliament. The idea is expressed in the British North America Act. It is there provided that until the Parliament of Canada, which was not then able to do it, should frame a general franchise, the franchises of the provinces should govern; and how should they govern? In order to prevent them from stealing a march in the way that has been done by Ontario——

HON. MR. HOWLAN—In furtherance of that they passed a Bill.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Yes, but it was provided that from and until the Dominion Parliament should otherwise provide, the franchises already existing at the time that Confederation was formed should be the

franchises that should govern the election of members of the House of Commons. What could be plainer than that? It was not intended that without the consent of Parliament those franchises should be changed. I admit that at the time of the passage of the Controverted Elections Act of 1883 there was a consent on the part of Parliament which had never been given before, and which probably was necessary in order to frame an election law—there was a consent that the provincial franchises as they then stood should be the franchises for the time being. There was another Controverted Elections Act passed in 1874, but since that time parliament has not consented affirmatively to a change in any of the franchises. There have been changes made, and I have already cited one, in the province of Nova Scotia, and I appeal to my hon. friend who sits opposite me (Mr. Dickey) and to my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) to confirm my statement that in order to gain a possible advantage over the party in power in the Dominion Government, the franchise of Nova Scotia was changed to bring in a set of voters, and to exclude a set of voters, for a Dominion election and for the local election. My hon. friend (Mr. Haythorne) disputed that statement when I made it. I appeal for confirmation to what I said to the gentlemen to whom I have referred —the hon. member from Amherst and the hon. member from Lunenburg. That was reason enough in itself to justify the Dominion Parliament in protecting its voters. There was no foundation for the statement that it was intended that the franchise of the provinces should rule the Dominion. There was every right on the part of the Dominion to make a franchise, and when it was found that the privileges which were left to the provinces referring to the Dominion only, were being abused, it was very natural to think it time that the Dominion should take to itself the power to decide the qualifications of those who should vote for members of its own Parliament, and I repudiate the idea that no such right is retained by the Dominion Parliament, or that no such right belongs to it: that it has no power, or no right, or no authority to exercise it. I happen myself to know something about the abuses growing out of the franchise laws of Ontario. I happen to know how the voters' lists are stuffed and I use the word emphatically. I myself on one occasion struck out 43 bogus votes in one township, on one scrutiny, which had been left unchallenged by the Ontario system, until I took it up myself. And every man of those 43 voters was a voter upon the Opposition side, and was brought in by the system which was adopted, as I believe for the purpose of giving an advantage to the side which was in power; and my experience is that, I presume, of one-half or three-fourths of the members from Ontario to-day, and I dare say my hon. friend who sits below me can confirm my statement—the hon. gentleman who has borne so gallantly the Conservative banner in the county of Glengarry, and who came to the rescue when scarcely another man dared to confront the powers that were then in existence, knowing he had not only to fight the Opposition but had to fight the voters' list where the mischief is concocted.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN—Yes, from the municipal councils down to the appointment of assessors.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—Yes, and yet my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Scott) says there has never been any objection to the Ontario franchise. He tells us that we are not in any way justified in dealing with this matter; that we ought not to deal with it; that nobody has complained of it; that nobody has petitioned against it; that nobody has has found fault with it. I can tell the hon. gentleman that as far as my experience is concerned it has been a crying evil in the Province of Ontario ever since I have had any part in public life. He also stated that my hon. friend (Sir Alex. Campbell) said that the Ontario Government had altered the franchise on the eve of an election. He did not say any such thing; he simply said that the franchise had been altered in Ontario, and had been altered with a view of giving an advantage to the majority who altered it. That is my statement also, and I believe the only way to get a fair voters' list in Ontario is to have the machinery for perfecting the

voters' lists in other hands than those to which it is given by the Ontario Act; and I think every man who is not a partizan of the Ontario Government, who has had experience there, will say the same thing. The Franchise Bill was brought into Parliament upon fair notice. It had been before Parliament for two years. It had been examined for two years, it was discussed and it was supposed that it would be brought to a vote, but it was withdrawn either at the close of last session or the session before. It was no new thing. It was no surprise. The first two months of the present session were occupied upon the thrice-told story of the national policy. It was turned over and under and inside out, and discussed in every way, and it was impossible while that discussion was going on to proceed with the general public business. It would be easy, by referring to the Commons Debates, to see who was responsible for that. When the franchise was brought down it was said to be a surprise, brought in at the end of the session; that so important a Bill as that should have been brought in at an earlier part of the session; that the Opposition were not to be allowed any time to discuss it or examine its details; that it was a Bill of tremendous proportions, dealing with questions which had to be examined section by section and line by line, and that it was an attempt to spring a bill on parliament and to get a snap judgment upon it. The *tu quoque* argument is not always a sound one, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that in my political experience, which is very limited compared with that of many hon. gentlemen in this House, an Act of the greatest importance was forced through parliament by the late Government, without an opportunity for discussion being afforded to the Opposition of the day—I refer to the Act authorizing the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway passed in the Session of 1874. The Bill was introduced May 12th, read a second time May 20th, and passed May 21st; Parliament was prorogued on the 26th. The majority refused to listen to the Opposition, prevented them from being heard by unseemly noise and interruption; and shouted down all criticism unrebuked by the Speaker or the leader of the Government. The Bill was forced through at three o'clock in the morning. We had good reason to complain of the tyrannical attempt to choke off debate upon a measure of such vast importance, but we were not sufficiently revolutionary to adopt obstructive tactics. But the Opposition complained that it was too near the end of the session to examine the Bill, that no time was permitted for discussion. Now considering that the patriotic Opposition have discussed it, according to my hon. friend's statement, for more than two months, they cannot complain that they have been treated as we were under their regime, on the occasion to which I have referred. As far as I can remember—I used to go into the House occasionally. Whenever I was there I never heard any one speaking on our side. I heard gentlemen on the other side discussing it, and I never heard anybody preventing them from discussing it. There was a little horse-play for the first two or three nights, and then there was a sepulchral silence on the Government benches. The Opposition talked, I will not say debated, as we were told to-day, for eight weeks. Hon. gentlemen, it was an attempt, a deliberate attempt, of a minority to coerce the majority. It was a deliberate attempt to destroy the principle of Parliamentary Government. If that attempt had been successful Parliamentary Government would have been impossible from that time.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman knows that there is no restriction to the constitutional usage of the British Parliament upon the Opposition. Except by the late Liberal Government of England no attempt has been made to choke down debate; it never has been proposed except by Mr. Gladstone's Government in their desire to stop the factious obstruction of the Parnellites, who were not in the position of the recognized party styled "Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition."

HON. MR. HOWLAN—And he has paid the penalty of it.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Yes, he has paid the penalty, and it has never been put in

force, because it is contrary to the British principles of free speech. Every latitude is given for discussing public questions on going into committee of supply and on various motions Such has been the tender regard of the British constitution for the rights of the minority. No such regard for the minority can be found under republican institutions. There is not a legislature in the United States that has not a clôture by which they can stop debate at any moment. In the French Republic and in the United States Congress and State Legislatures, the previous question can be moved, and any man can be stopped in the middle of his speech, and you can take a vote then and there on the question under discussion, and if his remarks are irrelevant, or tedious, or improper, any member has the right to move that the previous question be now put, and if, in the division which must follow, the mover can get a majority of one, that puts an end to the discussion. If there is a majority of one they ruthlessly stop such flights of oratory as we have heard sometimes, with greater or less pleasure and amusement, in this House. The reason why British Parliamentarians have not found it necessary to curtail the rights of the minority is this : it is supposed that the minority assuming that they will in course of time become the governing majority, will never put themselves in a position by which they may be hampered in turn when they come into power. That is all the restriction that is necessary for people of ordinary judgment and common sense. They can see very well that if 50 or 60 people out of 210 can prolong a legislative session for three or four months, by an attempt to force their will on the representatives of the people who are in a very large majority; parliamentary Government becomes impossible, and therefore they know if they succeed in their endeavor to throw out the majority and come into power nothing is to prevent the then minority from pursuing the same tactics. It is because minorities have heretofore been restrained by that consideration, that it has not been considered necessary to limit debate or apply anything like the previous question or the cloture. Now this leads me to a conclusion which I think is perfectly logical. I think it is evident from what we have seen for the last two or three months that the leader of the Opposition and his friends never expect to get in power. They would never have put themselves in such a position if they had considered success possible for their party. It is impossible that they would have done so; it is impossible that an astute constitutional leader would ever have allowed his followers to place him in the embarrassing position which Mr. Blake would occupy to-day if he ever expected to take the reins of power. My hon. friend from Ottawa stated that his patriotic friend had compelled the majority to adopt certain amendments. Now I fail to see that. I remember the story Mark Twain tells us when he was temporarily the editor of an Arkansas newspaper; he was assaulted by a man much more powerful than himself and he said "we inserted our nose vigorously in the teeth of that gentleman; we planted our eye again at his right fist, and threw ourselves on our back, and in that way we conquered him." I can tell hon. gentlemen here that it is quite an open secret that the main amendments to the franchise Bill were agreed to in caucus before they were proposed by the hon. gentlemen on the other side. It was natural in the course of the debate on such an important question that changes should be suggested—it was a new procedure. That Bill was not an iron-clad measure; it was expected that any reasonable proposition which was made fairly and logically sustained in a proper spirit whether by the Opposition or by supporters of the Government would be fairly considered, and I can tell hon. gentlemen that if one week had been employed in a reasonable and sensible discussion of that Bill by the Opposition they would have gained all—yes, more than they gained by their two months and a half of obstruction. If they had spoken upon it as men of common sense should have done, instead of talking as they did, misrepresenting the Bill as they did, letting the whole ruck of the benches loose with their floods of drivel and irrelevant chatter, if they had applied themselves to a reasonable consideration of the Bill without passion or prejudice, in the way men should meet a question of that kind, in the way a loyal Opposition should debate a question of such importance, like

gentlemen who desired to promote the best interests of the country—there would have been no difficulty about it whatever, and all proper concessions would have been been obtained. The amendments were reasonable, they were right. I am glad they are there, and we are not discussing the Bill now, as it was when first introduced. It is absurd for hon. gentlemen here, when this Bill is before us perfected by the other House, and discuss what might have been in the Bill—what possibly might have been put in the Bill, and what was in the Bill at the beginning. We have nothing now to do with that, and we have nothing now to do with woman-suffrage and other questions which have been discussed. We have nothing to do with the revising barrister pure and simple.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to criticise the decision of the Speaker.

HON. MR. ALLAN—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—The hon. gentleman says hear, hear. I say the hon. member from Niagara is criticising the decision of the Speaker and he has no right to do so. He is every day calling others to order: he never succeeds, yet at this very moment he is out of order himself. Was he in order in alluding to the eight weeks' fighting in the other House? I say he was not in order.

THE SPEAKER—The question of order was raised by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. On that question I considered on the second reading of a Bill of this character very great scope was necessary and properly allowed to gentlemen engaging in the debate. The hon. gentleman chose to indulge in a long argument against a principle which the Bill did not contain. Whatever might be considered with regard to the necessity of such an argument I thought it was quite proper for the hon. gentleman, if he chose to indulge in that line of argument, to do so, just as it would have been proper for gentlemen who hold a different opinion—who hold, for instance, that the Bill should contain a clause providing for female suffrage—to take the Bill on that ground and urge any argument in favor of that being the case. In the discussion of a Bill so important as this, affecting the constitutional rights of the people it would be most improper for the House to curtail the debate in the slightest degree. While, however, I decided that the hon. gentleman was not out of order in my opinion when he indulged in that line of argument I passed no opinion whatever as to the relevancy or necessity of that argument. With regard to the point of order now raised in reference to the hon. member from Niagara I think he is not attacking or assailing my decision in any way when he attacks the relevancy or propriety of the argument of the hon. member from De Lanaudiere.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I did not intend to attack the propriety or relevancy of the hon. gentleman's argument. I was answering more particularly the argument of my hon. friend from Ottawa, whose absence I again regret, and I was saying that I saw no necessity for discussing matters which are not in the Bill as it is before us. I do not think we should amend the Bill: we should either accept or reject it. It does not effect our seats here: it is more especially a Bill affecting the House of Commons who come from the people and who are responsible to the people. My hon. friend from Ottawa says that it was not modelled upon the franchise of any of the provinces: it could not very well be so. We could not take any special province and make that a pivot upon which to move our franchise bill. It certainly would have created great jealousy on the part of other provinces if we had taken the franchise of any one of them and thus virtually asserted that that province had a perfect franchise. Would it have made it more palatable to other provinces if we had accepted the franchise of any one particular province? I thought my hon. friend from Ottawa was very singularly infelicitous in the remarks he made on that part of the question and I thought that, and other remarks he made showed that he was only half-hearted in his opposition to the Bill. He also said the bill had in a certain way done good—that it had extended the franchise, giving it to the farmer's son in imitation of the Act which had already been passed in Ontario,

and that it had also extended it to wage earners. While there are objections in this House—and I can feel great sympathy with the gentlemen who raised them—to the extension of the franchise. We must march with events. We must learn to trust the people. We cannot expect or hope to make any cast-iron rule for the franchise, and adhere to that rule. This Franchise Bill, so far as I can read it, is an an advance in a liberal direction —as far as I think we ought to advance at this time. I can conceive, however, that before many of the younger men of this House have become as gray as I am, that there will be a necessity for a further concession. I can conceive that; I do not object to it; I think it will come; I do not think we should set ourselves obstinately against it, and I think the true way is to look it fairly in the face, and to accept it as an inevitable thing, but at the same time to throw about it as many safeguards for the protection of the electorate as is possible to provide, both in election laws for preventing and punishing corrupt practices, and, what is more important, for preventing the poisoning of the ballot boxes; preventing fraud at the fountain head; preventing the corruption of the voters' list. There is where the battle has to be fought; there is where it should be fought; there is where the trouble begins, and I say this Bill is a step in the right direction. Hon. gentlemen claim that we ought to trust the machinery which is framed by the local legislature rather than to trust that created by ourselves. Upon what ground? for what reason? what possible logical support can people find who urge that? Why should we not appoint our own men? What better are the assessors and the revisers of the voters' lists of the different provinces? What better are the men that might be appointed as commissioners—farmers of the different districts, as has been proposed by the hon. gentleman who has objected to my method of speech? Parliament has a perfect right to provide for appointing its own officers and I say we ought to put them there. The men who are to frame the voters' lists for our Parliament ought to be men selected for that purpose and qualified to do the work, and when we hear such an outcry against the revising barristers I ask who are the men to be selected under this Act? What manner of men are those who are held up as such monsters to the community? Let us try and find out; here is the Bill. Clauses 13 and 14 of the Bill are as follows:—

> The Governor General in Council may, within three months after the coming into force of this Act, and from time to time thereafter, when the office is vacant, appoint a proper person to be called "the revising officer," for each or any of the electoral districts of Canada, who shall hold office during good behaviour, but who shall be removable on address by the House of Commons, and whose duties shall be to prepare, revise and complete, in the manner hereinafter provided, the lists of persons entitled to vote under the provisions of this Act in such electoral district, and every such officer shall, before entering upon his duties, take an oath of office before any Judge of a Superior Court or Court of Record of the Province in which he is to act, in the form A contained in the Schedule to this Act, which he shall forthwith thereafter cause to be filed with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at Ottawa; and in the event of the death, resignation, removal, inability or refusal to act of any such revising officer, another may, in the same way, be appointed in his stead, who shall hold office under the same tenure, and with the same duties and powers.
>
> A revising officer to be appointed under this Act shall, in every Province except Quebec and British Columbia, be either a Judge or a junior judge of some county or district court in the Province in which he is to act, or a barrister of at least five years' standing at the bar of such Province; in the Province of Quebec he shall be either a judge of the Superior Court of Lower Canada, or an advocate, or notary of that Province of at least five years' standing, and in the Province of British Columbia he shall be either a judge of a superior court or of a county or district court, or a barrister of at least five years' standing, or a stipendiary magistrate: Provided always, that the same revising officer may be appointed for, and be required to discharge the said duties in respect of more than one electoral district, and may be appointed for a portion of any electoral district.

That is the bug-bear of the revising barrister—wherever a judge of a county court or a junior judge can be selected the duty is to select him. Now, against other revising barristers' decisions there is an appeal—an appeal which has no machinery in it which is expensive or difficult, an appeal which entails no charge beyond that of subpœnaing witnesses and the expenses of the attendance of

witnesses. Instead of that being complex and expensive as we are told, it is made as inexpensive and simple as possible, so that every man can take advantage of it, and I can tell hon. gentlemen that it will be far less difficult and expensive than the appeal procedure of the various courts of revision in Ontario. I know something of those courts, and I know from experience how troublesome and expensive they are. The appeal in this Bill is without expense: it is a direct one and it is to bring about a speedy and effectual settlement of the case.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—If I have a right to reply I would say there are expenses. Who pays the lawyer who manages the appeal?

HON. MR. PLUMB—The judge of the court can award cost for expenses for the attendance of witnesses and subpœnaing them but no more, and any man of common sense can go and look after his own case. My hon. friend from Ottawa said we first intended to admit the Chinese and the Indians without restriction to the franchise, but he acknowledges that the Bill was much improved in that respect—in fact he rather approved of it altogether. Well, the only change that I can see is that the Chinese are excluded. The Indians of a certain class are admitted. It was never intended to admit any others, and I say to-day that no more just and meritorious thing has been done by the Parliament of Canada since I have had the honor of having anything to do with it than the justice, tardy though it is, which has been done the Red Men who live on our soil and who possess the qualifications which are required in this Bill. I know something about them. The greater part of the Red Men of Ontario who will be enfranchised by this Bill live in the Counties of Brant, Middlesex, Haldimand and Hastings, and some others are scattered about in Kent, Essex and some other counties.

HON. MR. ALLAN—And in the county of Simcoe as well.

HON. MR. PLUMB—But the largest numbers are in Tyendenaga on the Bay of Quinte, and in the County of Brant. Who are those men that have been stigmatized by my hon. friend from Ottawa who has just told us that they are living in wigwams and huts, that they are non-tax payers, pensioners upon the Government, improvident people, who lose or consume their seed grain and must often be provided with a fresh supply; and last of all as the very worst thing he could call them—are so ignorant and debased as to be Orangemen? The Indians, he tells us, do not pay taxes: that they do not sit on juries, and worst of all, that they are Orangemen. When the American revolution broke out in 1776, the ancestors of the red men of the Grand River and Tyendenaga had their Hodonesaune, or Long House Confederation established between the waters of the Hudson and those of Niagara. They were the Iroquois, emphatically called by Parkman "the Indians of the Indians," led by Joseph Brant, (Thayendanegea) the Mohawk Chief, who went to England in that year to investigate the cause of the quarrel between the King and his subjects; they took his opinion that the King's cause was just, and resolved in council that they would not break the alliance with the Crown—the covenant chain—that is the term they used. They were the Mohawks, the Oneidas, the Onondagas, the Cayugas, the Senecas, and the Tuscororas, forming six independent nations, each speaking a different, although cognate language, each governed by its own traditions and laws, and they decided to stand by the British Government, a few only dissenting. What was the result? They fought bravely but without success. They lost their land, the fairest in New York State—most beautiful for situation. I know it well. I have travelled through it often. When the war was over those homeless people still led by Brant threw themselves upon the generosity of the English king, and how did he receive them? On the 24th day of October, 1784, a royal grant was executed by Governor Haldimand, which recited that in consequence of their adherence to the Crown the six nations had lost their property in New York, that they were a homeless people, and that in recognition of their great services and unswerving loyalty, a tract of six miles in width on each side of the Grand River, then called the Ouse, from its mouth to its sources, was given

in perpetuity to them and their descendants. To that magnificent heritage Brant conducted them. There they settled, eight years before Ontario was separated from Quebec. I had the honor of being invited by their descendents a year ago to address them at the centennial celebration of the grant, and I then attended their annual agricultural show, and I tell hon. gentlemen that it would compare favorably with any local agricultural show in Ontario. Their agricultural society has 350 members. It has been organized 17 years. They pay liberal prizes and receive large sums for gate-money. They exhibited as good barley and wheat, and oats, and corn as I saw anywhere last year. They had excellent horses, and well-bred cattle and sheep, and the show was attended by great numbers of orderly, well-dressed men, women and children, but they were all of the Indian blood, and all fall under the ban of my hon. friend from Ottawa. Those are the people who, we are told, lose their seed grain, those are the people who, we are told, are controlled by the Government agents. When they prepared for their centennial celebration they took the matter entirely into their own hands. The agent was invited. They invited me and several other gentlemen and delegations from the remnants of their tribes who are scattered about in other parts of the country and in the United States. When I called on the agent Mr. Gilkison, in Brantford, he did not know what the arrangements were. Nothing would be more unwise than for him to interfere with their internal polity. My hon. friend knows something of the Indian character, and he must be aware that they will resent interference with their freedom of action. Most of the Indians of the six nations are men of independent means. On the Reservation they have 13 schools, they have temperance societies, and I could have told my hon. friend from Ottawa, who is opposing the extension of the franchise to these people, that those temperance societies have a very large membership, and doubtless sustain the Scott Act. Some of those Indians may be Orangemen; there are a good many Orangemen in the country, of equally good standing with the hon. member, and I am not aware that it is a crime deserving disfranchisement to be one of them. I myself am not one, but if I were I do not think it would be good ground for disfranchising me. Here is a letter written by an Indian living on the Grand River reservation, a young man about 35 years of age, with an Indian wife, and an Indian family. I wrote to him making some inquiries as to the organization, land tenure, &c., to which I got this reply :—

"Kanyengeh, May 22nd, 1885.

"DEAR MR. PLUMB,—

Your favor of the 9th inst. was duly received, and its contents noted. And, in reply, allow me first of all to thank you for the very high compliment paid me in thus seeking information from me concerning my people and their affairs generally. And now with regard to the state of things on the reserve. First: Our lands consist of about 55,000 acres, surveyed into 100 acre lots, and although the whole of the lands are covered by one deed, still these lots are not looked upon as common property, but are held by individuals just the same as if they held them in fee simple, with the advantage that they cannot sell the improvements to anyone outside of their own band. These lots are held either by virtue of the original location made by the council of chiefs, or by the improvements that have been made by the occupant himself, or purchased by him from another who may have made the improvements, or he may also have purchased the same from another, who had a right to sell the same. And none can be dispossessed except when the lands are required for public use, and, even then, full compensation must be made for the occupant's improvements, or any improvements to which he had a right, and of which he is thereby deprived. An Indian belonging to the band may hold as many lots as he purchases from his people. Some hold as many as four lots, and, I believe, in one or two instances even more. I believe I shall be quite safe in saying that about 25,000 acres are under cultivation, 15,000 in pasture, and 15,000 in woods or bush. There are no national boundaries on our reserve. Every Indian is at liberty to buy just where he likes best if he can make a bargain with the occupant. Our organization consists of seven nations, viz.:—Mohawks, Senecas, Onondagas, Oneidas, Cayugas, Tuscaroras and Delawares. Each of these nations has a hereditary chief, according to the number of its totems or clans; thus the Mohawks are composed of three clans, the Bear, Turtle and Wolf; and each of these chiefs has his second chief, and his war chief. Some, or at least two, of the nations are composed of more clans than the Mohawks, and the Delawares have but one, as far as I know. There are however exceptional cases where a warrior is elected chief, either as a reward for services or as an

acknowledgment of abilities that may be possessed by him, so that we only partly adhere to the old organization at the present time; that is, if it was not so done from the beginning, but my belief is that these exceptional cases of election were allowed from the beginning by the "League" (the Hodonesaunee.) Any of the chiefs may be deposed for dishonesty, intemperance, immorality or incompetency; for the first three he must have had a fair warning to amend, then if he does not heed the warning he must be removed, and another appointed who is next of kin. This only applies to the hereditary chiefs. But in case of the removal of an elected chief there is no successor elected. The powers of our council of late years have become more limited, and its rules are also much changed, and both are gradually being swallowed up in the Indian Act. The provisions for the opening and repairing of roads, building bridges and making other public improvements are just what is contained in the Indian Act. Before the passage of the Indian Act the same thing was in operation, only perhaps not to the same extent as now. Our agricultural society has been in operation for 17 years and has done a great deal towards stimulating our people to adopt the improved methods of agriculture and the rearing of improved stock, so that at the present time our agricultural exhibitions are far ahead of any township exhibitions that have ever come under our notice, and I believe I can safely say that ours is ahead of any township agricultural society in the Dominion. In 1883 the members numbered 170, in 1884 225, and in this year, 1885, they number 350 members. Our schools about 12 in number are partly supported by the New England Company and partly by ourselves."

The New England Company was formed in England about the time of the restoration of Charles II., and Lord Clarendon was an active member. They have a small fund which yields £600 or £800 annually, I think, and they devote a liberal portion of their income to missions and schools among the Iroquois of the Grand River. I might speak of the Iroquois of St. Regis and Caughnawaga, and the Hurons of Lorette, of the Munceys and Delawares, and of the Masasaugas of Haldimand, whose Chief is a highly educated physician in large practice, and give many other instances in proof of the justice of the claims of the Red Men to enfranchisement, who are permanently settled and possess the required qualifications. The attacks upon them have been wholly unwarrantable, and they have been made victims of a desperate party struggle.

The writer continues:

"The Episcopalian churches are supported entirely by the New England Company. The Methodist denomination by the Conference and the Baptist and other denominations, I believe, are dependant on the voluntary contributions of their members. Our interest money is simply the interest of capital invested by the Government for us from the sale of our lands."

The hon. gentleman to whom I am replying called them pensioners upon the Government. They are not pensioners; they are great land owners. The Six Nations or Iroquois held their title deeds from the Crown before there was a Dominion Government; before there was a Province of Ontario. They permitted some of their land to be sold, because they had more than they could utilize—they had ceased to be hunters and trappers, and required only the area that was needed for farming. The letter continues:—

"The cheque, when the interest becomes due, is sent to our Superintendent for distribution, each getting an equal share and each one is at perfect liberty to do what he likes with his money, there are no restrictions whatever. In fact I think I cannot do better than draw your attention to Dr. Oronhyatekha's letter in the *Mail*, of the 6th of May, which shows everything in its proper light and is better than anything that I can prepare, but at the same time I am and will always be only too glad to give you any information in my power. I was sorry that I was unable to see you when the deputation was down to Ottawa. Any public documents you may be pleased to send will be thankfully received. Please excuse me for not being able to prepare my communication in better shape. My time has been so fully occupied by making the necessary arrangements in connection with my misfortune, and I have as it were snatched this half hour to do my duty to you and to my people, and I know that I have come very far short of it, but I know that you will kindly overlook that on account of my circumstances."

Of money, they have about eight hundred and fourteen thousand dollars in the Government Treasury, the proceeds of sales of their lands, and it is as much their own money as if it were in a savings bank at their credit. The Government holds more that three million dollars of trust funds belonging to Indians. This letter which I hold in my hand from that gentleman is in a most beautiful handwriting, as any hon. gentlemen who have any curiosity to examine it will see; it is without an ungrammatical expression, and there is not a word in it mis-spelled.

HON. MR. READ—And he never had a vote.

HON. MR. PLUMB—He has never had a vote, and has never had justice done him until now, and yet in 1839 a commission appointed by the English House of Commons to report on the condition of the Indians of Canada, says :—

"To all the Indians residing within the boundaries of our provinces the fullest and most complete participation in the rights of British subjects should be distinctly and unreservedly granted ; and means should be taken to make them promptly aware of the fact, as well as of the value of the boon and of the mode of taking advantage of it.

"Their present ignorance in these respects, though an impediment to their at once deriving the full benefit, and a valid argument for their having the temporary assistance of well selected guardians, does not seem to present any reason for delaying the measure which it would be scarcely possible for them to abuse, but which would prove grateful to their feelings and a stimulus to their exertions."

A copy of this report, perhaps the only one to be found in this country, was kindly handed to me yesterday by the Librarian. It was then, it will be seen, desired that some amelioration should be made in the condition of the red races among us. I do not know anything more worthy of the attention of the public of Canada than the present position and future prospects and possibilities of the Six Nation Indians. They are emphatically the Indians of the Indians. They have shown great powers of adaptation, while,at the same time, with that peculiarity which distinguishes the savage from the civilized man, they have adhered with great tenacity to many of their traditions. To this day their councils are talked into the wampum belts. Their system of mnemonics is still practised. It is not more than two years since Chief Johnson, formerly Speaker of their council,now 93 years of age, one of the most eloquent of a race of orators, was called upon to decide a question in dispute and he read the wampum belts for two whole days, and stated the words they perpetuated as consistently and as clearly and precisely as any man could do from a printed book. Another chief, one of the Mohawks of Tyandenaga on the Bay of Quinte, a distinguished temperance advocate, Chief John Green, is one of the most eloquent men I have ever heard speak on a public platform. We had a meeting at Niagara in August last in celebration of the the 100th anniversary of the settlement of the peninsula by the United Empire Loyalists whenhe addressed the assemblage in most logical and vigorous language.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I know him well : he is a very intelligent man.

HON. MR. PLUMB—No man could have delivered a more appropriate or more forcible speech. His enfranchisement is objected to by my hon. friend, who is the leader of the Liberal party in this House, and who urges the extension of the franchise, and yet is unwilling to extend it to the intelligent Indians. Chief Hill, the grandson of the celebrated Brant, also delivered an address on that occasion, and Chief Smith, the man whose letter I have just read, addressed us in as well chosen sentences and with as much pertinence and grace as any one that you will usually hear in a public meeting. A deputation of thirty Chiefs came to honour the occasion ; they would not permit us to bear any part of their expenses; they brought with them a skilful, well instructed brass band, and all the performers were their own people. They have their own extensive educational system ; their own system of taxation; they build their own roads and bridges ; they do not ask the Province for anything, and they pay their taxes as other subjects of the Dominion. They are taxpayers just as much as any who sit in this House or in the House of Commons—they pay taxes on the dutiable goods they consume. They do not ask the Province of Ontario to supply their schools or build their bridges—they are an independent people and pay the same taxes that white people pay upon the articles that come under the tariff of the Dominion, which they consume in as fair a proportion as any of the farmers in their vicinity, and it is a sneer upon them which I repudiate, to urge that they are in any way unworthy or unqualified to be enrolled as voters. They tax themselves for municipal purposes—there is no other form of provincial taxation—and I must again express regret that my hon. friend (Mr.

Scott) is not here to show upon what grounds, and upon what basis, those men are not to be considered tax-payers. In asserting that they are not he begs the question, and does not present fair, ingenuous argument. He tells us that those men live in wigwams and huts, but I can inform the hon. gentleman that many of the houses of those Indians are furnished quite as well as the houses of their white neighbors. In many of them you can hear the music of the piano—I would rather in many instances there and elsewhere that it was replaced by the hum of the spinning-wheel; many of the Indian families drive to church and market in as good style as the white farmers around them, and are in fact quite as prosperous as their white neighbours. Some of them occupy and cultivate as many as four hundred acres of land each. They are worthy men, but it must be confessed that the Indian has not the instinct of acquisitiveness as strongly developed as the white man, and therefore I think it is desirable that their valuable heritage should be guarded in such a way that they shall not be a prey to the white land-shark. I hope they may long enjoy the usufruct of the domain fairly won by the blood of their brave ancestors, and that they may never be tempted into taking away from the Government treasury the vast fund which they hold there, the interest on which is paid regularly, and honestly distributed. Designing men may look with covetous greed upon the fertile fields of their reserves, and may endeavour to obtain legislation by which they may be alienated; such efforts have been made, I trust they will never succeed. If they do, the red-men would soon find their money dissipated, their children in want. They are brave men, loyal men, men who are true to their families, and whose domestic virtues are an example which people of our race may copy, men who keep their children well dressed, well fed, well educated, and who are fit to rank with us in every particular, except perhaps that they have not the money-grabbing faculty developed in them to so large an extent as we have, and I do not love them any the less for that. I may say that they are a law-abiding people. They have hardly an officer of the peace amongst them, nor do they require police restrictions except to repress vicious outsiders. You do not hear of any outrages there. They are becoming a very temperate people; they are a virtuous people, a people of whom we ought to be proud rather than ashamed; whose efforts in the arts of peace and civilization we should by every means encourage. Dr. Oronhyatekha to whom the letter of Chief Smith which I have quoted refers, is a licentiate of the College of physicians and surgeons of Ontario. He is one of the Indians of the Grand River reserve, and has not the right to vote until this bill becomes law—I think I could show from his letter that he is quite competent to vote alongside of his white neighbour. We should make those Indians a typical race; we should endeavor to show, by what we can do for them, what are the possibilities of the forty or fifty thousand people, who, in God's providence are left to our protection, whose condition we, as the stronger dominant race, should do everything in our power to ameliorate. We should study the social evolution of the Iroquois and learn by it what may be done with other red men. From extreme barbarism, savages of the savages as they were 200 years ago, having the fiercest characteristics of their race, they have long since become an industrious law-abiding people who have buried the tomahawk, and have successfully taken up peaceful occupations. We should ascertain by watching the progress of the Iroquois what we may possibly do with those unfortunate bands which are thrown upon our hands—that we have to provide for and protect, that we have either to fight or feed, or teach to feed themselves. It has been our disgrace that in the debates and comments upon the Bill before us, elsewhere, every possible contumely has been heaped upon those unfortunate people, who cannot defend themselves, and I intend, as long as I have the power to do so, to answer for them as to what I believe are their capabilities, their possibilities, and I say that it is a shame to keep those intelligent men any longer in subjection, whose condition I have described.

HON. MR. READ—Where were they found in 1812 and 1815?

HON. MR. PLUMB—Yes, and where were they found from 1776 to 1784 also? Found fighting under the British flag, as true to the Government as the most loyal of British subjects, never swerving from it, always ready to shed their blood and devote their energies to the defence of the Crown, and of the people with whom they were associated. Hurrying to our aid from the pathless forest, at the call of their indomitable chief—ubiquitous, untiring, irresistible, doing the duty of ten times their number—so marvellous in their power, so quick in their movements, so terrible in attack, that in 1763, Sir William Johnson wrote to the Lords of Trade in England that the Iroquois had conquered the whole of the territory, extending from the Atlantic sea-board to the Mississippi, from the Great Lakes to the mountains of Georgia, Eastward to New Brunswick and the Bay of Fundy, and northward as far as the snows would permit them to go. He stated that they held that great extent of country by right of conquest—that they had brought its Indian inhabitants under subjection as tributaries. It is supposed that they were never able to muster more than 5000 Braves for the war-path—but the extraordinary league by which they were united freed them from the fear of foes at home, and they were enabled to extend their conquests wherever the forest trail or the stream might lead them.

HON. MR. READ—And at Lundy's Lane they were to be found.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Yes at Lundy's Lane and at Stoney Creek, wherever there was a battle to be fought or a desperate act to be performed they were in the front, and to-day in the Haldimand Battalion there will be found volunteer companies of Iroquois of the Grand River Reservation who will rank in discipline and appearance with the best white men, and will be able to do good service whenever they are wanted. My hon. friend from Ottawa said that the Indians were not drawn as jurors. I do not consider that it is a necessary qualification for a Dominion voter that he should be a juror. I am not aware that the Dominion Government prepares jury lists. They are made up in the counties from tax lists, and I venture to say that as intelligent a jury could be selected from among the Indians who are to be enfranchised by the Bill under consideration, as could be found elsewhere. I sincerely congratulate my Indian friends upon their admission to equal privileges with ourselves. They well deserve them and will make good use of them.

My hon. friend from Ottawa was pleased to refer to the distribution of seats in 1882. He said that then as now, we played with loaded dice, that we have again endeavored to so frame a measure that it will perpetuate the power of the Conservative party, and that we have won four general elections out of five, and that we ought to be satisfied with that. Well, if we have won four elections out of five, it shows that we are very liberal in making changes that may jeopardize the strong position he acknowledges we hold, and that we are taking considerable risk in dealing with a subject with which perhaps we could not or would not deal if we were now in a weaker position. I think that is a logical answer to the argument of the hon. gentleman.

HON. MR. POWER—It is so kind of you.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I do not heed the interruptions of the hon. gentleman from Halifax. However intended they do not disturb me in the least. I was about to say, that my hon. friend from Ottawa, in speaking about our redistribution Act said nothing about the redistribution Acts of Ontario of which we have a right to complain. He said that Mr. Mowat's Government did not divide townships. I happened to know, that in what was called the redistribution Bill of the Ontario Government, they did divide townships—they split them along main roads and concession lines, put one part in one district and one part in another. In that way the county of Dufferin was made what is called a hive for conservatives; the idea was borrowed from the swarm. There are several such hives in Ontario. Mr. Mowat was far in advance of us in that sort of bee-keeping. The County of Dufferin is so Conservative that no man has ventured to offer as a Liberal candidate in the constituency since Mr. Mowat packed it. It is so in other

places. There are gentlemen here from Ontario who well know the facts that I refer to. A redistribution of the same ingenious sort has been made within the last year. Since this very franchise Bill was introduced, the Government of Ontario has again distinguished itself in that way. I do not wish to use an unparliamentary word, but its last redistribution bill is more flagitious than the one it passed twelve years ago. It is well worth my hon friend's study, his familiarity with Ontario politics will make it specially interesting to him. He says there have been no complaints that any unfairness or abuse has arisen from the Provincial franchise regulations of Ontario. There have been a thousand complaints in the public press. They have been made at public meetings everywhere. They have been reported from year to year in records of courts of revision. I have been familiar with them from the time I entered public life, and I think I can appeal to my Conservative friends from Ontario here to bear witness that there has been a general outcry on the part of the public—perhaps not from the Liberals. It is very probable my hon. friend from Ottawa does not hear any remonstrance from his side. It is very natural that they should not grumble as long as they have the advantage; but if we can judge anything of the public feeling in regard to the necessity for the change we seek, we can judge it from the effect of three months of agitation—such agitation as has never been known before in the history of Parliament, such attempts to prejudice public judgment as have never been paralleled under any constitutional Government. The party managers ordered the local drill-sergeants to call out the faithful, and hold indignation meetings at which fiery resolutions, ready-made, were produced by party fuglemen, petitions were drawn up and men were employed to obtain signers at 15 cents a hundred, and after all this agitation what has happened? There has been no enthusiasm, there has been no public excitement. You can go through the whole Province of Ontario—I can only speak for that Province—and you can hear conversation on general topics; you can hear men speaking about the crops; you can hear them asking when Parliament is to be prorogued; you can hear them complain that Parliament is sitting too long, and that a Cromwell should enter the Commons and disperse it and order Mr. Speaker to "take away that bauble," but you hear nothing of this wicked franchise Bill that we are told here is to destroy the liberties of the people of Canada. You hear speculation as to the result of the trials in the North-West, and you hear enquiry when the volunteers are coming home, the comparing of opinions about the crops, you see the electors of Ontario calmly smoking their pipes in peace and comfort; but that there has been any special interest excited against the Franchise Bill, or that the country has responded to the Opposition outcry is untrue. We have had lately the result of an election to this Parliament in a district not far from the seat of Government—in a district where the Government were said to be more unpopular to-day than it was anywhere else in Canada; and yet the Reform party dared not put up a candidate to oppose the Conservative nominee who was elected by acclamation, and who was introduced in the Commons two or three nights ago while the leader of the Opposition was making a six hours' speech against the Government upon the North-West troubles which I think he might have let alone under the circumstances, though I have no right to criticize it here. That election does not look as if the public took any stock in the outcry against the Franchise Bill. I am very sorry for having detained the House so long, and I greatly regret that my hon. friend to whose speech I have endeavoured to reply is not here to-night. I can only say that I have tried fairly to meet some of the arguments which it contained, and that for my part I consider the Franchise Bill as it now stands a measure worthy the support of the Conservative party, and also of those liberal members on the other side who can see a little beyond party lines. It has my sincere, hearty approval. I shall vote against the hon. gentleman's amendment and for the Bill, and I hope when they come to reflect upon it even our friends on the other side will find that the remarks made upon it to-day, and the ten weeks' arguments in another place should commend it to their confidence, and I trust that when the division is taken upon

it those gentlemen will be found largely ranked on our side.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL—Some allusions have been made to the feelings of the members from the Province of Quebec concerning this measure. I might, perhaps, go so far as to say that I do not think there are many members from our Province in the other House who at first received that Bill with much satisfaction. I find in this measure a great many good features, and as regards the point which has just been alluded to by the hon. gentleman from Niagara, the enfranchisement of the Indians, I think it is a very proper thing to do. I had several times during the past year occasion to call at the Department of the Interior and to claim the rights of the Indians of Caughnawaga who reside close to the division I represent in the Senate, and I may say that there are many Indians in that district who occupy such a good social position that they ought to be accorded the same political rights as other subjects of Her Majesty. I may say that I have had for the last three years one of those Indians in my office as law student, and I understand that he has presented himself to-day for examination for admission to the bar of Quebec, and from what I know of his qualifications I have no fear as to his success. I am satisfied that he is now admitted to the bar. He is a very intelligent and hardworking young man, and for the last two years he has been the President of the Legal Association formed among the law students of Montreal. I mention this fact to show that there are among those Indians men whose public position it is desirable to improve. There are families in Caughnawaga who have amongst them wealthy merchants. I know of one Indian family who cultivate not less than six farms. They have adopted a good system of agriculture, and they are successful stock-raisers, and have well-stocked farms. I am very glad to hear the statement of my hon. friend from Niagara as to the condition of the Indians in Ontario, and this confirms me in the view that the mode in which some of our Indians are treated by the Department here is not justified. In fact, last year I had to apply here to obtain for one of those families the right to have white people serve them. They wanted farmers for their farms, and they wanted servants for their houses, but, according to the regulations, they could not have any without permission from the Department here, and that permission was refused. I applied several times myself to the Minister of Justice asking that some provision should be made to extend to those Indians the ordinary rights of British subjects. There are many other provisions in this Bill which I consider a great improvement on the present law, and if we could have, what I do not expect we can obtain, the right to fix the franchise left to the provincial or municipal powers, I think there would be a great deal in this Bill to commend it to the House. Whatever may be the merit of this Bill, it does not change my opposition to it as a whole. In my opinion, in legislating for this Dominion, we should do our best to preserve provincial rights as carefully as possible. I consider that in this lies the future prosperity of the Dominion. I do not question the right of Parliament to enact such a law as this. Of course I do not think that right has ever been seriously challenged; but, as the hon. gentleman from DeLanaudiere has very properly stated, while Parliament has the right to legislate in the direction proposed by this Bill, it does not follow that we should so legislate. It is a proposition which nobody will deny, that since Confederation the right to regulate the franchise has been left to the provincial powers. This is a right which has hitherto been enjoyed by the provinces. By this legislation it is proposed to take away that right from the provinces, and give it to the Federal Parliament. It is impossible to deny this proposition, so that it is, in fact, a transfer from the provincial power to the Dominion, of a right exercised by the provinces—in other words it is a step in the direction of centralization. It is a question in which all the provinces are interested, inasmuch as most absolute authority should be left to the province to control its own affairs. I say that it is in the interest of the provinces to assert this principle; and, as everybody knows, the province to which I belong is specially interested in maintaining that position. It is well known that we have our own peculiar institutions, our laws our language, and a great many

other interests which the great majority of our people contend for, and to which the majority of the Dominion are hostile; so that it is a very important right which is now under the control of the majority in the Province of Quebec, and when this Bill becomes law that control will pass into the hands of the Dominion—that is, it will be in the hands of the majority—I do not mention it in a sense that will be offensive to anybody, but it will be in the hands of a majority which is, politically speaking and socially speaking, hostile to our laws, our language and our institutions. So that I consider that it is our duty and our interest to keep our provincial rights, and especially for Quebec there is a decided interest in continuing to exercise those rights, and that is the reason why, though I am sorry to be in this position, I shall be obliged to vote against this measure. There is another principle laid down in this Bill which I consider to be wrong. It is the concession of what is called here the "farmers' sons franchise." At first sight it appeared to me a proper thing that such a right should be granted to a certain class of farmers' sons; but I do not consider that it should be granted in the way it is proposed in this Bill. For instance, as here proposed, the political power of the son, or of the sons of the farmer, as created by this Bill, will be equal if not superior to that of the father. We ought not to lose sight of this fact. Take the case of the farmer who has five sons; the sons being granted the right to vote will be in a position, if they differ in their opinions from their father, to destroy his vote five times over. If that were the only objection we might perhaps say that there is an equal chance that the sons might entertain as sound views as the father; but as the law is framed, the franchise may go to one of the sons, who in one sense should not be considered as "a farmer's son." Take for instance the case where the property possessed by the father is not sufficient to qualify three or four sons as voters. The property will qualify first the father, second the eldest son, and so on, to the extent of its value. Then there is a provision that the fact of the sons being absent as fishermen or mariners will not disqualify them as voters—or the fact that the son may be studying in the city will not disqualify them. Supposing a man has a property valued at only $300, and he has a son studying in a city for the profession of law or medicine, and that he has a second son who remains on the farm; that second son may be the only party in the family cultivating the soil, and still he will have no right to vote on that property. The right will be first with the father, second with the son who is studying in the city, perhaps hundreds of miles away from the homestead, while the only man whom the law has in contemplation, that that is, the son who is to succeed to the farm, who is working on the farm, and who is supporting the family, will have no vote at all. This shows that the idea which is at first conveyed by this proposition to give the farmer's son the right of voting, will in a great many cases be a failure. I must confess that when I heard of this Bill, before reading it, I was pleased to a certain extent to know that the farmer's son would have a vote. I thought it was contemplated to give to the son who remained on the farm with the father, and who is one of the principal means of the support of the family, the right to vote; but it is nothing of the kind. The same right is given not only to the eldest son, but it is given to the son-in-law, so that a case which will happen very often will be that the father will be obliged to receive into his family, on the farm, either his son-in-law or one of his sons who will not consent to work—often the scapegrace of the family. The father is obliged to support him at home to prevent him running the streets and dishonoring his name; yet that man, who may be what is called in French a *mauvais sujet*, will come from the city and eat the bread of idleness at home, and will be there to fight against his father's interests and cancel his vote by his own. If the father has two sons of the same character, his political influence will be completely destroyed. Of course I do not contend that this right of voting should not be granted at all to the son; because if the father has property enough to enfranchise the four or five sons, it is for himself to decide at the proper time to give property to his sons, and the better way is to leave this power to the father to control his family

by encouraging those who are doing well, and punishing those who are doing wrong. But if this Parliament should come to the conclusion that something should be done in this direction, it should not be done otherwise than by allowing the father to say which son shall be entered on the voters' list.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I would ask my hon. friend if it is not one of the requirements of the law that the son shall have resided a whole year on the farm with the father; and if that would not be a sufficient protection?

HON. MR. TRUDEL—There is a provision in the Bill which does something more; it provides that the fact of the son going from home to study in the city, or his being a fisherman, or a sailor, is not to deprive him of his right to vote, so that in those cases the sons may go round the world seeking their fortunes—sometimes spending the money which their father has provided them with, and may afterwards come home and acquire the right to divide the privilege that should belong to the father, of voting on the father's property.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—He should be treated as a prodigal son.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Of course there are a great many provisions in this Bill which are open to objection, but I do not wish to occupy the time of the House by referring to them at present. I will only refer *en passant* to the machinery which is created for the revision of the voters' list. I think that in putting in force such a Bill as this it will be a great misfortune, as it will create difficulties in the country, and will be a source of expense. One great source of expense, and, I may say, of ruin, is the number of tribunals in the country. For instance, we have three or four courts to which we appeal from one to the other. In Quebec we have an appeal from the Superior Court to the Court of Review; and then we have an appeal from the Court of Review to the Court of Appeals, and from the Court of Appeals to the Supreme Court of the Dominion, and from the Supreme Court to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. In this way, when a man has to contest a case at law, he may be brought from one court to another, and the suit will have, practically, no end. Now, we have the local elections, and the Federal elections. We have a contestation of those elections which, as everybody knows, is a source of law suits. We have the Circuit courts and the Court of Commissioners, or Municipal Councillors, which are so many bodies which partake, to a certain extent, of the judicial character; and to learn, for instance, how to maintain all their rights before those different organisations or powers is a matter of study which very few farmers can undertake, and very few of them can hope to learn how to avail themselves of their rights in that respect. By this Bill we create new machinery—there is a revising officer who will have the attributes of a court. For instance section 28 says:—

"The revising officer shall, for the purposes of the said preliminary revision of the first lists of voters and of the final revision of the first lists of voters for polling districts, as well as for the revision of any subsequent lists of voters in polling districts under this Act, have all the powers of any Court of Record in the Province, as to compelling the attendance and the examination of witnesses, the production of books and documents, and the taking of evidence under oath before him, any court or sitings held by him for any such preliminary or final revision, and shall have, generally, all the powers of a Court of Record."

So that there is one more set of machinery created as a Court of Record. The hon. gentleman will see by the 42nd section that these officers will have such powers as to be in position to impose penalties; after a person is served with a summons the revising officer may punish such person as if it were a Court of Record; so that there will be this new machinery dispensing to the population not only the benefits of the law but also its punishments. I consider if there was only this reason against creating another tribunal, that it alone would be sufficient, because we have too many tribunals already. Everybody knows that I am a lawyer and I am not speaking in the interests of the profession to which I belong. If the object of the bill was merely to create a single magistrate, or judge, or revising officer, there would not be so much harm in it, but bear in mind that these officers will be obliged to employ assistants. Our revising barrister will have officials for his

court, and in great centres of population a good many officials will be required. This will create in some places a lot of small officials, who will receive a few dollars of salary, not sufficient to make a living out of, and anyone who knows much of these matters must be aware that there is no worse population than those who exercise functions which place them, to a certain extent, above the laboring classes but do not yield them sufficient remuneration to give them an honest standing in the community. Those officers will have, to a certain extent, reason to abandon their ordinary occupations; they will be above the positions which they held before, and will be obliged to derive a revenue from some source. These officials are the worst class of people we have, and though we have already ten times too many of them, we are going to add another class to their number. Although I am not familiar with what has taken place in the province of Ontario for the last five or ten years, I think that this legislation has been provoked, to a certain extent, and from a certain standpoint may be considered necessary by many, owing to the way in which the municipal powers have been abused. I shall feel great reluctance in voting against the Bill, because I have heard sufficient on this subject to be satisfied that those who support it are fully justified in seeking a remedy for a state of things which could no longer be tolerated. It is with much regret, therefore, that I find a remedy chosen which, to my mind, is worse than the evil. I repeat it is too bad that we who come from the Province of Quebec should find ourselves in such a position as to be obliged to vote against the Bill, but the principles and interests involved are such that I do not think we ought to hesitate. What I mentioned first is of such importance that I consider under no circumstances whatever ought we to give our consent to depriving the provinces of the exercise of some of their rights. Now, I know we have a perfect right, as members of this Parliament, to pass this Bill; but it is also our privilege to refuse our consent, and I consider, under the circumstances, that it is our duty to vote against the measure.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—The hon. member from Niagara has made an appeal to me on a point of fact, and it is due to him and to the House to mention my impression of the correctness of his statements. He referred to the fact of a law having been passed in Nova Scotia disqualifying certain officials of the Dominion and, as bearing upon this question, the necessity of this Act. I am bound to say that the statement he has made is perfectly correct; —that it is so, I need only refer to our own statutes to prove, because if the House will look at the statutes of 1882, chapter 3, section 5, they will find a provision which it became necessary to make in consequence of an enactment by the local legislature of the Province of Nova Scotia. I hope my hon. friend who has just sat down will listen to this, as it enforces in a very strong manner the remark which he made as to the provocation which was upon the Dominion Parliament to make some law of this kind. The section is as follows:

"Notwithstanding anything in any law of the Province of Nova Scotia or of the Dominion of Canada no employee on the Intercolonial Railway in that province shall be disqualified to vote as an elector at any future election of a member or members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, if he shall have the necessary property and other qualifications therefor required by law. In the event of the name of any such elector being an employee on the Intercolonial Railway, having been omitted by the revisors from the list of qualified voters for a member of the General Assembly of Nova Scotia under the laws in force in that province, or to be returned to the county clerks or clerks of the peace, or omitted from the lists of voters deposited by the Sheriff with the county clerks or clerks of the peace or obtained by the returning officer or furnished to the deputy returning officer, it shall be lawful for such employee to vote as an elector at any future election of a member or members in the House of Commons of Canada, on his taking or offering to take before the Sheriff or returning officer the following oath, viz:—

I (A.B.) do swear that I am legally qualified to vote at this election, and I verily believe that my name was omitted from the list of electors by reason of my being an employée of the Dominion Government on the Intercolonial railway at the time such list was last perfected and for no other reason."

Now, that law was passed because it was found necessary, in consequence of an Act which had been passed by the legislature of Nova Scotia disfranchising in local elections all the employees on the

Intercolonial Railway, and they were very numerous in that province.

HON. MR. POWER—It was perfectly right, too.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I am not going to enter into the question whether that was a proper law to pass for the purpose of preventing them from voting at local elections: that is not the question, but the point is this: that in consequence of that enactment they were *ipso facto* disqualified and disfranchised from voting in Dominion elections, and that arose from the operation of the law, which is still the law of the land until this Bill passes, as affecting Dominion elections. What is that law? That the franchise for Dominion elections shall be the same as that for local elections. I had not intended to say anything on this question at all, and yet after listening to the long and ingenious speech which was made by my hon. friend from Ottawa, I confess I was very much impressed with the weakness of the position which he took, and I concluded that it was not right that I should remain silent, after the extraordinary statements which he made on that occasion. He said, with regard to this point, that he thought the provision in the British North America Act showed that the intent and meaning of the framers of that law and of the British Parliament, were that this franchise should remain forever to be settled by the local authorities—in other words, that the local franchise should always be the Dominion franchise. My hon. friend surely, when he made that statement, must have given very little attention to the subject, because if he had reflected for a moment he would have seen the reason why that provision was put in the British North America Act. Without it there would have been no franchise at all to vote upon for members to serve in the first Parliament of the Dominion. That was the reason, and the sole reason. There required to be an election before Parliament could meet to make any law with respect to the franchise, or upon any other subject whatever, and as that was necessary there was a provision, which was not merely experimental, but a necessary provision in the Act, that, until the Dominion Parliament decided otherwise, the elections should be run upon the local franchises in the provinces.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—There was no machinery.

HON. MR. DICKEY—There was no machinery. We could never have assembled here because we could not have represented anybody, There could not have been a House of Commons, because there was no franchise on which members could be elected. Now, that is the simple point, and while my hon. friend did not for a moment profess to doubt any more than my hon. friend who has just sat down, the propriety of the franchise being left to the Dominion, he based his argument against this Bill, upon the very slender foundation, that because to meet this contingency that, in the first election there would be no electorate unless the British North America Act provided it, that, therefore, it shall always remain so.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Does not the hon. gentleman think that if it had been the intention of the framers of the Confederation Act to leave it to the federal authorities after the first election, they might have pursued a course somewhat similar to that which is followed before a speaker is elected in the House? The clerk proceeds, and it is provided after the speaker is elected the House will then be presided over by its proper officer. They might just as well have said that for the first election the list prepared by the municipal powers should be used, and after that another law should be passed, but nothing of the kind is said in the Act.

HON. MR. DICKEY—My hon. friend is reduced to a very desperate expedient to be obliged to put the case in that way, because it amounts just to this that because a temporary provision was made for a particular purpose, and because the House of Commons have not thought proper to pass a law and send it up to us for the purpose of making a change of this kind until now, that therefore it shall remain so forever and there never should be a change. This is the argument of my hon. friend, and while I am upon the

subject I may as well notice the admission he made, very frankly, that he admitted the right of the Dominion to make this law.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Yes, I admit it.

HON. MR. DICKEY—But he says "In making that law you will interfere with the local regulations which at present exist and therefore I shall have to vote against the Bill." Now has not my hon. friend reduced himself to a singular dilemma when he is obliged to use an argument of that kind. Because how could the Dominion Parliament enact a law which would not necessarily interfere with the local regulations with regard to Dominion elections? How is it possible that any law could be passed? They do not interfere in any way with the regulations for local elections, but they simply provide for Dominion elections. I have called his attention and the attention of the hon. member for Ottawa to the fact that so early as the year 1882, three years ago, Parliament found it necessary, in consequence of the action of the local legislature in one province, to legislate in this way, and enact that notwithstanding those laws these officials of the Intercolonial Railway should not be disenfranchised—that they should have their rights. If my hon. friend is correct that law should never have been on the Statute book, as it would be a law which would be an invasion of the local rights under the Constitutional Act. My hon. friend knows very well upon that point that he always has found me standing by his side when any improper attack was made upon the rights of the different provinces. I have frequently stood alone here, among gentlemen who usually act with me, upon that point, and exposed myself to some invidiousness for standing up for the rights of the provinces, but on a question like this I feel that I can no longer take a position of that kind because this is a measure not interfering with the rights of the provinces but simply affecting the right of the Dominion to pass a law with regard to the election of its own members.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—I stated as a fact that the provincial legislatures were exercising this right now, and that by this Bill we were taking away the exercise of this right and giving it to the Dominion. I do not pretend that it is a breach of the constitution: I do not pretend that it is, constitutionally speaking, a violation of the law, but I say that this is a right which, as a fact, is exercised to-day by the provinces and I do not see that there are sufficient reasons to change the present state of things and to take the exercise of the right from the provinces and give it to the Dominion.

HON. MR. DICKEY—Of course it is exercised by the provinces at present, and yet my hon. friend admits that we have a right under the British North America Act, and can at any time exercise that right.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Yes.

HON. MR. DICKEY—My hon. friend admits in terms that the right exists in the Dominion, and that they do not interfere with the present local rights any further than the British North America Act empowers them to do—that is to say, to regulate the election of Dominion members. That is all. My hon. friend from Ottawa based his first and chief argument against this Bill on the ground that, as he phrased it, the Conservative party ought to be satisfied to leave the law as it stands, because they have been successful in four out of five elections. I can quite follow the answer given him by my hon. friend from Niagara on that point, and tell him that so far from proving this Bill ought not to pass it proves the very reverse. It proves that while the Conservatives ought to be quite satisfied, as he says, with the position of matters now, they are yet willing to give up the advantage that they possess at present, and to enlarge the franchise. They are willing to run the risk of a larger franchise, a greater number of voters to pass upon their conduct, and so far from this Bill being open to the attack which has been made upon it, any fair minded, person can see that the Bill did not originate in any view of giving a party advantage, but quite the reverse. My hon. friend from Ottawa asks triumphantly, in speaking of this question of

the revising barrister, "would Lord Salisbury or Mr. Gladstone ever think of bringing in a Bill with such provisions in it as there are here, with regard to these revising barristers." I will answer them on that point, from their acts not very long ago—within a few months: but before I do that, I will ask upon what ground he wishes this House to object to this provision for revising barristers looking after the list of votes? What has the law done? The law of my own province is that assessors are appointed by the local authorities. Formerly the grand jury elected a double number, such as six, and from these the Court of Sessions selected three. This power has since been transferred to the Municipal Councillors, but it is in fact the same—it is a local appointment. Every person who has been conversant with elections in a province must know that when you look at the names of the revising officers you have a pretty good idea of what the complexion of the list of voters will be when it is returned. That is the result of these assessors going on and making lists of voters. They publish it and call for objections to be made by a certain day. The voters are to appear before them on that day; what is the result then? They appeal but the appeal is from Cæsar to Cæsar—from their own list to themselves—to see whether those should be struck out, and then the names are decided upon by these assessors and so far as I recollect there is no appeal from that decision whatever. That is the state of the law now; but what have you got here? The security that you have is one responsible person, an educated man.

HON. MR. SCOTT—A politican.

HON. MR. DICKEY—A politician, my hon. friend says; there is no politician among the assessors! I have stated, and it is a matter that cannot be contradicted, that it is notorious, that these assessors are appointed for certain purposes. That is the result of these local appointments; but the revising barrister can be removed at any time by the House of Commons for misbehavior; he is to be of a certain standing and if he chooses to do anything wrong he must take the consequences, including an appeal from this decision. Therefore I cannot sympathize with the objections which have been taken to that part of the Bill, and I now will answer the challenge which has been issued by the hon. member from Ottawa as to what should have been done or should not have been done in another place. My hon. friend says "would Lord Salisbury or Mr. Gladstone think of introducing a Bill with such a provision as this—providing for revising barristers of this kind? Why, I tell him, in the registration Bill which has recently become law in England, these revising barristers in Ireland were to be appointed by the Lord Lieutenant—by the Government.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Hear, hear! that is Irish freedom

HON. MR. DICKEY—It begins to pinch.

HON. MR. SCOTT—No, not at all.

HON. MR. DICKEY—These revising barristers are appointed by the Government through the Lord Lieutenant, and one of the Home Rulers made an objection. He rose and argued when the Bill came down to the House of Commons again from the House of Lords, and the suggestion was made that they should not be so appointed, but by some local authority—by the judges or otherwise.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DICKEY—My hon. friend says "hear, hear"; do not be in quite such a hurry. We will see whether Lord Salisbury or Mr. Gladstone is capable of doing such a monstrous thing as this is described to be. These objections were made, and, after being talked over, the Home Rulers, who have never been slow to challenge a division of the House when they wished to put their views on record, gave up the contention and allowed the Bill to go without a division.

HON. MR. POWER—I should like to ask the hon. gentleman to produce that statute. It referred to the city of Dublin, and not to the whole of Ireland.

HON. MR. DICKEY—In the *Times*, from which I obtained my information, it said that it referred only to Ireland, not to England. It does not matter whether it referred to Dublin alone, or to the whole of Ireland, because the challenge was that Lord Salisbury or Mr. Gladstone would never legislate in such a way. It proves this that the matter was so clear that the Home Rulers were quite satisfied with the propriety of it and did not ask for a division. It proved another thing, that it was a provision made by a Liberal Government headed by Mr. Gladstone. That was the legislation, and it is a distinct answer to the challenge which has been given.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Legislation for a country governed as Ireland is, does not apply to Canada. We are a free people here; they are not a free people in Ireland.

HON. MR. DICKEY—The hon. gentleman challenged us to show where Lord Salisbury or Mr. Gladstone would do such a thing.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Coercion laws do not exist here; that is no parallel. We are not governed by Dublin Castle or a grand jury named by Dublin Castle.

HON. MR. DICKEY—My hon. friend evidently did not know anything about it when he issued the challenge.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I was perfectly familiar with it. It was mentioned in the other House and was ridiculed there. The idea of attempting to apply a principle here which is applied in the Government of Ireland!

HON. MR. DICKEY—It was done by a Reform Government led by Mr Gladstone. If he chooses to attack it I am perfectly willing. Now we come to the amendment which has been moved and the vote which has been asked to be passed on this Bill, and there again we are met with a difficulty. Some of us who are here at present and who have been here much longer than I have been, recollect how on repeated occasions we have heard my hon. friend from Ottawa denounce any attempt to interfere with the legislation from the House of Commons in a matter which concerned themselves. What have we before us? A resolution placed in the Speaker's hands to throw back this Bill in the face of the House of Commons—this Bill which has caused so much anxiety and trouble in the minds of the hon. gentleman's friends in that quarter. He proposes to burke it, not in the way they attempted there, but in his own peculiar way here, by asking this House, in a matter which concerns the House of Commons, which regulates the franchise to elect their members—he asks us to give it the six months' hoist and to throw it back to them. Well I do not think that is exactly the course that moderate men in this House will be disposed to pursue, but I think they will be less induced to do it when they find the source from which it comes, from an hon. member who has repeatedly warned us against taking any such course with measures of that kind from the House of Commons.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The warning did not prevail.

HON. MR. DICKEY—The hon. gentleman says the warning did not prevail, and therefore my hon. friend has got one rule for himself when he is in power and another rule for himself when he is in opposition. I feel I am not trespassing on courtesy when I call attention to his own inconsistency. Under the circumstances I think the House would do well to negative that motion, because it strikes at the Bill: it admits of no amendment. He refuses to take the Bill into consideration at all. He throws it back to the House of Commons. A position more repugnant to parliamentary courtesy I have never witnessed before in in the whole course of my parliamentary experience.

HON. MR. POWER—Before entering upon the subject generally I wish to say a few words in reply to what has fallen from the hon. gentleman from Amherst. That hon. gentleman undertook to produce a precedent for the action of the Government in the creation of the revising barrister provided for under this Bill. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa challenged any

member to produce an English case where such an officer had been created, and my hon. friend from Amherst has his case at hand. The facts of that case came out in connection with a statement made by the leader of the Government in the other House. The Premier, challenged in the same way, after some time produced this case. He said "In the city of Dublin the same thing was done." He did not make the thing general, as my hon. friend has, but gave the case of the city of Dublin. He said that for the city of Dublin a revising barrister is appointed by the Government and is not appointed as the other revising officers in the United Kingdom, who are appointed by the judges on circuit, or the municipal authorities. If there was one case in the city of Dublin it would have been a very poor precedent. But, when this case came to be explained, as it was explained at the next meeting of the House, it lost its value altogether. The facts of the case are these; under the election law as it stood, the Recorder of Dublin was the revising officer, and was also the officer charged with the duty of revising the jury lists. The recorder of Dublin was a man somewhere about 90 years of age. He had become incapable, from his great age, of discharging the duties of revising the electoral list and the jury list, and his was such an exceptional case that the Government had to step in, and apply this exceptional law to meet his case, and when it comes to be explained in that way, the case loses all its value. In fact it is a precedent the other way. Then the hon. gentleman reflected on the impropriety of the motion that the Bill be read this day six months. I think there is a great deal to be said in favor of the propriety of that motion, even admitting that the contention of my hon. friend from Amherst was right, and that the Senate was wrong in interfering with some small bills respecting the electoral franchise which came before us in former years. This House is supposed to represent, in a peculiar manner, the rights of the Provinces. This right of deciding who shall vote for members of the House of Commons has heretofore been exercised by the Provinces; and now it is proposed to take that right away from them; and I think that there is a very strong argument in favor of this House throwing out a Bill of that sort. I fail to see why the hon. gentleman from Ottawa should be taunted with being inconsistent at all in this matter. The hon. gentleman from Amherst said a good deal about the revisors in Nova Scotia, reflecting, I think, very unjustly and unfairly on the character of the officers in that Province; and we had some reflections from the hon. gentleman from Niagara on the revisors in Ontario. It is a somewhat singular thing, if the revisors all over the Dominion are as partizan as they are represented to be, and if they are as we are told partizan chiefly on the Liberal side, it is an astonishing thing that so large a majority of Conservative members are returned on the lists made up by those partizan Liberal officers. The thing is absurd on the face of it.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I did not say the revisors were all Liberals. I said that whenever you come to see the complexion of the revisors you could foretell the way the election would go.

HON. MR. POWER—I understood my hon. friend to say that the revisors were all on the one side. In the county of Halifax I have had opportunities of knowing how the lists are made, and I think one can gather almost nothing from the politics of the assessors or the revisors. I have hardly known a case where a charge of unfairness against the revisors or assessors has been substantiated. It is as well while dealing with the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Amherst, to dispose of this question of the local assessors and revisors. Comparing the position of the assessors and revisors with the revising barrister, we find that the assessors are, as a rule, chosen by the county councils, or elected by the people in the small districts in the several municipalities. The Assessors act under the eyes of the people who know them well. If the assessors assess a man for $50 more than he ought to be assessed for, everybody in the neighborhood knows it, and there is an outcry about it. If a man is assessed for less than he is worth, he is not always so ready to cry out; still other people will, and acting as the assessors do, and as the revisors act now, under the eyes of their neighbors who know them, and the circumstances of the people on the list, it is

practically impossible for the assesssors or revisors to be guilty of any gross outrages or improprieties. There is no doubt that the revisors as well as the assessors occasionally have their leanings towards one party or the other; but hon. gentlemen will see this, that if the assessors in one polling section happen to lean one way, the probabilities are that the assessors in the adjoining district will lean the other way, and as a rule, taking any one county in the province, you will find that the lists are on the whole, made out fairly. If in one county there may be a little unfairness in one direction, it is made up by a little unfairness the other way in the adjoining county—not deliberate, open unfairness, but the result possibly of a little bias in those officers. The fact is that there has never been any serious complaint made. We have heard murmurings from defeated candidates. The natural tendency of the candidate is to think that the man who gives him fair play gives him a little less than fair play. You rarely or never find a charge of unfairness substantiated against a revisor or assessor; and that is the best evidence that there is nothing very serious in those complaints. Let us now compare the position of the revisors and assessors under the existing law with the position of the revising barrister under this Bill. As I have said, the assessors and revisors are acting among their neighbors. If a name is improperly left off, the neighborhood knows it. They know that John Smith who is qualified to vote is left off, and if the omission is dishonest, public opinion is brought to bear upon the officers, and they are compelled to do their duty. How is the revising barrister? He comes down once a year; he knows nobody in the district; does not know how much people are worth, or anything else about them; and if he has a party bias, as he probably will have, being appointed by one party.

HON. MR. ALLAN—He is appointed by both.

HON. MR. POWER—He is appointed by the party in power. When he comes down to the polling district, how will the list be made up? The revising barrister will probably get his information from the Conservative manipulator of the polling district. He will get from him the list of names that ought to go on—that is in addition to the names which are upon the assessment roll; and I imagine it will be found to be an exceedingly difficult thing to put on the name of any liberal voter which does not appear on the assessment roll. It will be an exceedingly difficult thing to get the names of Liberal voters on income franchise in provinces where there is no income tax, as in Nova Scotia, upon the voters' list.

Going back to the general question, I do not think that the arguments advanced by the hon. member from Ottawa and the hon. member from DeLanaudiere have been met at all. These two hon. gentlemen laid down this principle, and I think it is a perfectly sound principle, that legislation which affects the large mass of the population as this legislation does, and which is not asked for by anybody, for which there are no petitions, and for which there has been no demand by public meetings, is to be regarded with suspicion, that it is *prima facie* bad and objectionable. We have never heard of any petition for this Bill, or that there have been any resolutions passed in favor of it before its introduction; and therefore I take it that this measure is one that the public did not call for, and which is to be looked at by the public with suspicion. It is perfectly true that under the British North America Act we have a right to pass this Bill; but there are a number of things we have a right to do under the the British North America Act which we do not do, and there are numbers of provisions in the Act which are worded in the same way as the provision with respect to a Dominion franchise is worded, and which have been let run on for a long time without being interfered with. There are several of those provisions in the Act.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—What are they?

HON. MR. POWER—I do not feel called upon to read a great number, but I shall read some, and I may say that the very next section to the 41st section shows how accurate the hon. gentleman from DeSalaberry was as to the question which arose between him and the hon. gentle-

man from Amherst. The 42nd section of the British North America Act says :

" For the first election of members to serve in the House of Commons the Governor-General shall cause writs to be issued by such persons, in such forms and addressed to such returning officers as he thinks fit, &c."

If it was the intention of the framers of the Confederation Act that the franchises existing in the provinces at the time of confederation should cease to be the franchise after that election, the provision would have been worded in the same way. Then section 47 says :—

" Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, in case of the absence from any reason of the Speaker from the chair of the House of Commons for a period of 48 consecutive hours, the House may elect another of its members to act as Speaker, and the member so elected shall during the continuance of such absence of the Speaker have and execute all the powers, privileges and duties of Speaker."

There are scores of provisions worded in that way.

HON. MR. DICKEY—And some of them have been acted upon.

HON. MR. POWER—Some of them have and some of them have not been acted upon ; and it is not necessary to act upon them at all. Here is the fact, that we have worked under this system since 1867, and there has been no serious complaint made of the working of the system. We have had no petitions asking that the system be changed, and it has not been attempted to be shown that there was any serious objection to it. The only complaint made has been the sort of complaint we have heard to-night from the hon. gentleman from Amherst that the revisors are sometimes partizan. We know that the revising barrister will be always partizan, except where he is a county judge.

HON. MR. CARVELL—Do not except the county judge please.

HON. MR. POWER—Well, I shall. We must remember that it is natural to suppose that the legislature of a province would know better what franchise suited that province than the Parliament of the Dominion.

HON. MR. ALLAN—Or the Government of that province.

HON. MR. POWER—The legislature knows best what suits the people of the province. My hon. friend seems to think that that is rather absurd. Hon. gentlemen will remark that when the leader of the Government introduced this Bill in the other Chamber, he did not speak on it for three quarters of an hour or half an hour as the leader of this house did ; he spoke for 8 minutes, and the only reason he gave the House for introducing the measure was that uniformity was desirable ; and now we find that towards the close of the discussion that uniformity has been broken through altogether. We find that, driven by the logic of facts, finding that if the principle of uniformity were carried out the Bill would probably result in serious injury to the Government in certain provinces, the Minister decided that they would give up the sole reason for introducing the measure, as far as Prince Edward Island and British Columbia are concerned. If the Government have recognized the fact that the legislatures of those provinces know better what suited them than the Dominion Government do—

HON. MR. KAULBACH — Or the Dominion members.

HON. MR. POWER—I contend that as long as a province is represented here by a certain number of members, the legislature can be trusted with deciding by whom they are to be elected. Supposing there was something in the argument as to revisors in the various provinces, I think the course which the Minister of Justice indicated that he would have preferred, might have been adopted, and we might have left the franchise with the several provinces, and the Dominion Government might have appointed officers to revise lists. I do not see myself that that would have been necessary ; because in the province of Ontario, as to which the greatest complaint is made—in fact it is the only province as to which complaint is made —in that province, at the present time, the county judges are the court of appeal from the revisors. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman from Ottawa has called

attention to the fact, and it is a very important fact, that in the United States, the greatest and most successful Republic that the world has yet seen, they have had every since the declaration of Independence the same system that we have found to work so satisfactorily here since Confederation. It has been said by some hon gentlemen in this House, and it is one of the reasons given outside for the introduction of this measure that we should have a franchise of our own. That is a narrow-minded sort of argument. If we do not find the need of a franchise —if we find the lists are properly made up now, and do not feel the want of a franchise of our own, why should we have it? You might as well provide that each member should be provided with a rattle; there would be just about as much common sense in the provision. My hon. friend from British Columbia is making some inarticulate sounds behind me; but that hon. gentleman and his friends have taken care that the benefits of this Bill should not be applied to British Columbia, and they have taken care also that the Indian who is looked upon as being such an addition to the voting power of the older Provinces shall not vote in the Pacific Province: and I do not think it lies in the mouth of hon. gentlemen from that province to say anything against our opposition to the Bill.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B.C.)—I am very sorry for the exception myself.

HON. MR. POWER—Then I am very sorry that the hon. gentleman has not a little more weight in the councils of his party. As to this one argument which has been advanced in favor of the Bill—the argument of uniformity—I think it is something like what the crater of Vesuvius was found to be by the hero of "Used Up,"—there is nothing in it. There is nothing in this plea of uniformity. First we have British Columbia and Prince Edward Island excepted, so that the uniformity is broken there. Then we have the tribal Indians enfranchised in the eastern provinces, while the same Indians are not enfranchised in Manitoba and British Columbia. The truth is there is less uniformity now than before; because before, in each of the provinces there was one franchise: now there will be two franchises in each province, and in British Columbia and Prince Edward Island there will be three franchises; because taking Prince Edward Island, you will have in that province for the local elections manhood suffrage; then for the Dominion elections you will have a body of voters who are 21 years of age at the time this Bill goes into operation, and they will be entitled all their lives to vote; then you will have a third class who will come of age after the passage of this bill who will not have the right to vote unless they have property. There are three franchises in those provinces. In Ontario you have two voters' lists made up on almost the same basis; for in some cases the qualification differs by only $50. The franchise in Ontario is, contrary to what has been stated by the hon. gentleman from Amherst and by the leader of the Government, more liberal than that embodied in this Bill. The law which is in force there now, and which would be the law that would govern the Dominion elections if we did not pass this Bill is more liberal and gives the franchise to more people than this Bill does. There is a difference in some cases of $100, and in others of $50. The Bill which we have before us requires a real estate qualification in a city of $300. Under the Ontario law it is only $200. The income franchise in Ontario is $250; under this Bill it is $300, and so on; and the same thing applies in the other provinces. In Nova Scotia there will not be a very great difference between the two franchises, but there will be a great deal of confusion to the ordinary voter, who has not time, and is not enough interested in politics to look after his rights. One of the results of this system will be that the revising barrister will do away with the necessity for the employment of any solicitor for the conservative candidate, and the liberal party will have to employ a solicitor of their own to look after the interests of their party. It is an exceedingly clever move to make the country pay for the legal business of conservative candidates throughout the Dominion, while the liberal candidates will have to pay for their own solicitors. I do not care to dwell at this hour of the night on the confusion that will be caused in the minds of the electors in other ways by the existence of those two lists, confusion which will be the greater on account of the close resem-

blance of the franchises. There is one subject which has not been adverted to by anyone in the discussion here, and that is the vast expense that the working out of this Bill is going to involve. We cannot sappose that the revising barrister will be paid less than $500 for his services, because no barrister of any weight or respectability at all would undertake the duties for any less sum than that—in fact it is putting it too low altogether. Then the revising barrister is to have a permanent clerk, and a bailiff; and one cannot suppose that the expenditure will not exceed $1,000 for each constituency. In this way the annual cost of the machinery of this Bill will be something not less than a quarter of a million of dollars a year—nearly as much as a session of Parliament used to cost a few years ago; and when one thinks of the very little substantial good that is to be got out of the passing of the Bill, he cannot help feeling that a quarter of a million of dollars is altogether too much to pay for it. There is another circumstance which hon. gentlemen supporting this Bill have left out of sight, that is the fact that the right to make up the lists of the persons who shall vote is taken away from the people who have had it for a great many years, and who still have it in every English-speaking country in the world. There is no English-speaking country, and I think hardly any free country in the world where the lists of voters are not made up in the first instance by officers selected by the people, or officers selected by representatives of the people; but this Bill proposes to take that right away from the people. It is not for the people to say now who are to select their representatives; it is the Government of the day who take to themselves the right to say who shall elect the representatives. It would be a much shorter way, perhaps, if the Premier were to select the members himself, it would save a great deal of expense and trouble. These are some of the objections that have struck me as applying to the Bill generally without reference at all to its details. As to the Bill itself, anyone can see on looking into it that it is a very complicated measure, and will require a great deal of study. It will require a good deal of study from a lawyer or a legislator before he will understand it, and it will be a complete puzzle to the ordinary elector. I do not think it necessary to say anything as to the Indian question, because I think the Indian should be just in the same position as the white man. We make no distinction as to color between the negro and the white; and I do not think we should make any distinction between Indians and whites; and I call attention to the fact that in Ontario the Indians are placed in exactly the same position as whites. I find there, amongst the persons qualified to vote:—

> "All Indians or persons with part Indian blood, who have been duly enfranchised, and all unenfranchised Indians or persons with part Indian blood who do not participate in the annuities, interest, moneys or rents of a a tribe, band or body of Indians, and do not reside among Indians, subject to the same qualifications in other respects, and to the same provisions and restrictions as other persons in the electoral district."

That, it seems to me, is as much as any Indian has a right to ask. If those Indians who are so eloquently described by the hon. gentleman from Niagara are all that he paints them, why is it that they are kept in tutelage by the Government under the Indian Act? Will the Government enfranchise these men and give them a right to buy and sell and make contracts, to sue and be sued? If they do then the Indians would have the right to vote under the Ontario Statute; but until that time, while they are treated as children in the eye of the law, they should not be treated as grown men for the purpose of voting. The Indian now enjoys immunities from execution and so on; and in return for that he is deprived of the right to vote. If he chooses to assume the responsibilities of a white man, he should be allowed the right to vote, and he then has a vote in Ontario. One thing that must strike one in looking over the Bill is that there is no principle running through it at all. The franchise is not based upon land; we find land and, we find income, we find relationship to persons who own land; but personal property does not seem to confer a vote except in the form of income. As to to the revising barrister, enough has been said by gentlemen who have gone before me. I only say that you will search the records of all the free countries in the world without finding any precedent for this revising barrister. In England the revising barrister in Middlesex is appointed

by the Lord Chief Justice of England ; in other counties he is appointed by the Senior Judge of Assize, and is appointed only for one year.

HON. MR. GOWAN—They are continued from year to year during good behavior, and practically it is for life.

HON. MR. POWER—It is as a rule. If a judge appoints a revising barrister this year, and he does his duty properly he is reappointed next year, but still his tenure is from year to year, and he is appointed by the judge and not by the Government. I might mention that in one case at any rate, the revising barrister—Beales I think was his name—was not reappointed, because he had been taking an active part in politics, and was known to be a strong partizan; and his services were discontinued when the year ended. There is one matter to which the hon. gentleman from Amherst referred and which I have overlooked. He referred to the Statute passed in the year 1882. It was an amendment introduced in the Senate to the redistribution Bill. I thought myself at the time it was one of the most objectionable Acts ever perpetrated by the Senate. The redistribution Bill of 1882 did not deal with the franchise at all; it simply dealt with the boundaries of electoral districts, and this amendment which my hon. friend read was introduced in this Chamber for the express purpose of carrying the county of Halifax for the Conservative candidates. I might mention that it was successful; that if it had not been for that amendment made here in the Senate, the county of Halifax would at the election of 1882, have returned one Conservative and one Liberal member—that there were enough railway votes given to one of the Conservative members to secure his return. I want to call the attention of the House to the facts about the Nova Scotia statutes. The Minister said that in the provinces they kept continually altering the franchise. I may say that this year 1885, is the first time that any serious alteration has been made in the franchise of Nova Scotia since 1863. In 1871 an Act was passed by the legislature of Nova Scotia, entitled "An Act to secure the Independence of the House of Assembly," and that that Act disqualified employés "in the Post Office, the Custom House, the Inland Revenue Department, the Lighthouse service, on the Government railroads, in the Crown Land office, or the local Public Works and Mines."

It has been customary to disqualify civil servants. Until very recently, in England, the civil servants were disqualified from voting, and the title of that Nova Scotia Act indicates its object. It was for the purpose of securing the independence of the House of Assembly. Hon. gentlemen will remember that at that time important matters were being discussed between the Dominion Government and the province, and the object was to prevent officers of the Dominion Government from influencing the elections to the Local Assembly ; and as to the railway officials, I think there was no doubt as to the necessity of this measure, because I know that on one occasion—in 1870 or 1871—the railway *employés* of Halifax went to the polls in a body, and it was perfectly natural that the Local Legislature should disfranchise those men because their vote was not a free vote.

HON. MR. READ—Did they vote by ballot?

HON. MR. POWER—The vote by ballot at provincial elections was introduced in 1870, I think, and at Dominion elections in 1874. There was just one matter that the hon. gentleman from Niagara laid some stress on, and I think that it deserves to be mentioned. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Mowat's redistribution bill of this year was a gerrymandering bill. I have paid some little attention to the discussion on that matter, and I do not think it has ever been established that there was anything very unfair about Mr. Mowat's redistribution bill.

HON. MR. CARVELL—Of course not.

HON. MR. POWER—I am going to give an authority on that point. I notice that the Toronto *Week* which is generally supposed to be a fairly impartial paper—at least it was during the winter—said at the time this measure was before the Local Legislature, or just after the measure had passed, that it could not be fairly looked upon as be-

ing an unfair or partizan measure. I take the opinion of the *Week* in preference to the opinion of gentlemen, no matter how well informed, who have very strong political feelings. I think we shall only be doing our duty if we save a great deal of money to the country, a very large annual expenditure, and if we leave the provinces the power which they have exercised ever since Confederation and exercise fairly as well as one can see, they having returned Conservative majorities to the House four times out of five. I think it is exceedingly ungrateful on the part of the Conservative Government to undertake to treat so badly the people who have treated them so well.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Although the hour is late I wish to reply to the remarks of some of my hon. friends. The hon. member from Halifax thinks it is not right to "treat so badly" those who have treated the Government so well. I agree with him, but I do not see that there is anything unfair about this Bill. Not a man is disfranchised by it, not even in British Columbia or Prince Edward Island. All those who enjoy the franchise now will still have it, and in every way there will be an improvement. Therefore I cannot see why my hon. friend says that anybody is treated unfairly by this measure. If there is any subject which is peculiarly within the power and province, and belongs specially to the House of Commons it is one of this character, and we should be careful before we attempt to change this Bill. We may give it a fair criticism, but if there is anything which belongs peculiarly to the House of Commons on which they have chiefly to determine, it is a Bill of this kind. I think the representatives elected by the people are the best judges of the franchise which they ought to have. We find that after devoting two months to the discussion of this measure in the other branch of Parliament, out of those who voted upon it only thirty-five of the whole House supported the motion for the three months' hoist. Therefore I hold that this Bill is not only one peculiarly belonging to the other branch of Parliament and therefore one which we should be slow to amend, but the opinion expressed by the representatives of the people in that Chamber has been very strongly in its favor, and the Bill has been passed by such a large majority that I think the leader of the Opposition ought to hesitate before he moves the six months' hoist, or endeavor by any means to destroy its usefulness and effective working, and deny the franchise to tens of thousands of the wealth-producing people of this country. As regards civil rights and the basis of the franchise for the local legislature, we do not attempt to interfere with it. We say the franchise for the Local Legislature is with the province. Provincial legislatures ignore municipal boundaries, and so do we provincial boundaries. In the same way the basis of representation in the Dominion House of Commons should rest, as our constitution declares it rests, with the Parliament of Canada, and we should recognize no provincialism or provincial bounds in a matter of this kind I know that the people of the Dominion have been surprised that the Dominion Government, that the Parliament of Canada, have so long deferred exercising the rights of franchise, the fountain of law and order which belong to them, and the root of government, a matter wholly within the purview and authority of the Dominion Parliament—that we should be content to let the local government legislate for us. In one province a man may now be disfranchised who, in another, would have a vote; it seems unreasonable on the face of it, and justice and common sense dictate and the great mass of the people, through their representatives, say that we should have a uniform franchise. It is quite evident to my mind, and it cannot be denied or doubted that the framers of the constitution intended that this power should be in and exercised by the Dominion Parliament—that the representatives elected to this Parliament should make the franchise and provide the machinery by which members of the House of Commons should be returned; otherwise the British North America Act would not have so declared it, and it would not have gone on the statute book in such emphatic terms, and it is only, as the hon. member from Amherst has remarked, because it was absolutely necessary that we should take at first the existing machinery in the different provinces by which the members of the first Parliament held after confederation could be

elected; and before such parliament assembled how could it exercise the rights possessed under the Confederation Act to fix its own franchise? The provinces, therefore, were allowed, of necessity, not to fix the franchise for Dominion elections, but the first House of Commons was to be returned by the franchises then existing. But what do we find? Not only does the Confederation Act confer the right on this Parliament, but we find immediately after the Union the framers of the constitution who came here to carry it into operation as the representatives of the people, recognized that right at the very first meeting of Parliament. We find in the first speech from the Throne after the union, amongst the subjects mentioned is a franchise bill for the Dominion. The hon. gentleman from DeSalaberry says that it never was intended by the framers of the constitution that this subject should be taken out of the hands of the local legislature: yet here is the fact, the indusputable fact to the contrary, that in the first speech from the Throne delivered after the union our right to fix the franchise for the Dominion is recognized, and a bill for that purpose is foreshadowed, and was introduced in 1869; and again, I think it was introduced in 1870, when, although it was discussed, no definite action was taken upon it. We find at that time it was not made a party measure; our right to it and the necessity for it were not questioned. The desirability of uniformily in the franchise was recognized by all parties, and it was not considered to be a party measure at all. Both parties recognized the right and not only the right but the duty of this Parliament to fix a franchise for themselves. I quote the language of the then leader of the Opposition, Mr. Mackenzie, and I will also show that the present leader of the Opposition endorsed the principle of the Bill and that both recognized the right which we possess and our duty to legislate thereon. I may state also as a fact that the late Senator Brown, in his organ the *Globe*, then censured the Government of the day for not having passed a bill of this kind and condemned the delay. Therefore I say not only has the right been conferred upon us by the constitution but, the moment Parliament met to legislate here under the constitution, that right was recognized and acted on; and not as a party question but as a matter on which the Dominion Parliament should legislate and as to which all parties were agreed. In the speeches from which I am about to quote there was no denial of the principle that there should be a uniform franchise. It was admitted and recognized by everyone at that day, and it was never advocated by anyone on either side that each province should continue to be allowed to fix whatever franchise it pleased for the election of members to the Dominion House of Commons. The chief details of the Bill, which was then proposed, were very like those of the Bill now before us. The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie was then leader of the Opposition, and these are his words: "When the Minister of Justice first introduced the Bill, he said it was not a party measure, and the Opposition were quite ready to treat it in that way." The Hon. George Brown, in the *Globe*, the organ of the Liberal party, on 15th March, 1870, said: "There is no doubt that a judicious election law is very much needed"; and in the same paper, on 20th May, 1872, Mr. Brown complained and censured the Government for its failure to push the Franchise Bill to its second reading, and stated there was no excuse for the delay. I ask hon. gentlemen opposing this Bill, how these facts, and the utterances of the Liberal leaders, accord with their assertions here this evening: that it was never intended that this Parliament should deal with the franchise? They know well, as everybody knows, that for years, ever since Confederation, a franchise bill has been talked of in Parliament and out of Parliament, and all the main features of the Bill have been for years before the country. We find Mr. Blake, the present leader of the Opposition, also saying, in the Parliament of 1870:—

> "They were all agreed as to the necessity of an Electoral Act, and however much he might oppose some of the details of the measure he had no idea of opposing the second reading."

We find, as I said, the present leader of the Opposition, then a leading member of the Opposition in the House of Commons, admitting the principle of the Bill and approving of it, and we find at the same time that when the Bill did not pass but was delayed, the Hon. George Brown published articles in his newspaper, the

Globe, in 1870 and 1872, approving of a franchise measure and saying it was very much needed, and urging that a Bill of that nature should be passed. It was well known that the present leader of the Government favored establishing a uniform franchise for the Dominion. Not only that, but for the last two or three years we have had a Franchise Bill before the country, and if the people were opposed to a measure of that kind we would have had both Houses flooded with petitions against it, for we know how cheaply the Opposition can get them up. But the hon. gentleman from Halifax, as well as all others, has failed to show that there is any hostile feeling in the country to this measure. Had there been such a feeling my hon. friend would have been the first to fan the flame of discontent. He has been down to Nova Scotia since the introduction of the measure and he has failed to find any feeling in that Province hostile to the Bill. In fact we all feel down there, every Nova Scotian, every fisherman feels, that in passing this measure Parliament is conferring a boon upon the people. It is extending the franchise to tens of thousands of the wage-earners of the country, the men who make the wealth and build up the prosperity of the country. Instead of injuring the people this Bill extends the franchise everywhere to the laboring, wealth-producing people, so that every man who deserves the name of a man will be given the right to vote. The vagrants and tramps only will be excluded. I can easily understand why the Opposition here, who refused when in power to grant any incentive to labor in the country; who would even now deprive the working classes of those industries which give them employment; who would have them beggared as they had been beggared by the policy of the late Government—I can understand why the Opposition when they find every industry in the country active and the laboring classes praising the policy of the present Government which enables them to obtain a fair day's pay for a fair day's work—I can understand why the Opposition here should fear the result of extending the franchise to those men whom they kept in pauperism and bondage during the five years that they held the reins of power. They may well fear and tremble at the consequences of passing this Act which would enable the farmers' sons as well as the industrious masses of the cities to express their views at the polls and declare who shall represent them in Parliament. Now what class of people should be excluded? Why do we find gentlemen opposed to this bill? Is the franchise too high or is it too low? We find some gentlemen from Quebec expressing the opinion that it is rather too extended, and preferring real estate as the basis, while on the opposition side of the House they do not venture to say that it is either too contracted or too expanded. What industrial class in this country has not been favored by this bill? Are they not all alike? I would go further than this Bill extends, and approve of manhood suffrage with residence and registry. I believe it it the purest franchise you can get under all the circumstances. In rural districts I think it is the right suffrage: but there are certain tramps and vagabonds always to be found in large towns who ought not to have the suffrage, and if it were not for that class I would freely and willingly go for an extension of the suffrage to all residents with registry, being men of full age. Now I have shown what you all know, that not only was this right given to us under our constitution, but that it has been recognized from the very first meeting of the Parliament of Canada and the principle of a uniform franchise for the whole Dominion has been admitted at all times not by one party only but by all parties in the Dominion. It is only now, when the Opposition fear, and rightly fear, the consequences of giving such an extended franchise that they desire to obstruct legislation and to defeat the will of the people expressed through a very large majority of their representatives in the other House. As the hon. member from Amherst remarked, it cannot be said for a moment that the Government here are afraid to go to the same people who returned them at the last election. Not a man, by this Bill, is to be disfranchised who, at last election, voted, but we are also extending the franchise to tens of thousands, to those who, under the policy of this Government, a paternal policy, have qualified themselves to vote under this Bill, who have acquired sufficient property and earn sufficient wages to enable them to vote. As regards the Indians

I will say nothing: I think the hon. member from Niagara showed us so fully and in such an admirable speech, what their rights are, that we must all be convinced that we should be the last to trample upon them and deprive them of any rights which they can demand. We have taken from them their property, and deprived them of their natural mode of living; the hon. gentlemen who are opposed to this Bill would like to keep them in bondage instead of encouraging them to become good citizens and to take a share in the privileges and duties of citizenship. As regards the revising barristers, my hon. friend says there is no necessity for them in Nova Scotia. I will ask him to refer to the proceedings in the Nova Scotia Legislature when the new franchise was introduced there. We had on that occasion even members of the Government declaring that the present assessment was inefficient and bad, and that they could not approve of it. If the hon. gentleman will look back over the fyles of the papers, he will find that members of the Government in the House admitted that the assessment system was faulty, that it was to a large extent unsatisfactory: that may not have been the word used, but it conveys what was meant, and they unsparingly condemned the present revising system—that it was not at all satisfactory. We know that under the local laws the revisers and assessors are generally selected by violent partizan councillors for party purposes. We know that under the municipal system there is a great incentive to elect councillors who will control the electorate. For that object great excitement is got up, and were it not for that fact the best men would be returned; but instead of returning the best men, violent partizans are returned who will appoint such men as will carry out the wishes of the party to which they belong, and generally most rabid politicians are appointed as assessors and revisors. Is this Parliament to be controlled by such a system as that? The hon. member from Halifax says if such a thing happens in one county, it is counterbalanced by some other man in another county, who will act on the other side the other way. Is that an argument why the the will of the people should not be properly expressed at the polls; that two wrongs shall make a right; that, because the lists are not properly made out in one county, the evil is to be counterbalanced by a corresponding evil on the other side in an adjoining county? That is the argument that he made here. I cannot help dwelling on it—it is monstrous, that although in one county by the improper exercise of their duties by revisers and assessors, a wrong man may be returned for Parliament, partizan officers in the next county, on the other side, may make up for it. I ask hon. gentlemen to pause and consider if such machinery should be the basis of responsible government by a parliamentary majority. That shows that the whole system is bad, and when he attempts to compare such irresponsible revisers with men who will be appointed under this Act, men selected from one of the highest professions in the country; men who must and will be appointed because of their fitness for the position: the hon. gentleman fails to appreciate the value of this measure. Those men are responsible for their acts, and besides, there is an appeal from their decision not only on matters of fact but on matters of law, so that I do not know of any greater guards and checks that can be made and thrown around this Bill to perfect it and to prevent it from being used in a partizan manner. A barrister who wants to live by his profession and be respected in a country cannot act as a partizan when he takes an office like this. He knows that if he performs his duties faithfully and honestly, his office will be continued as long as he is able to perform his duties. He is as independent as a judge on the bench, and is as qualified as a judge on the bench for the position he holds; and I am surprised that my hon. friend, occupying the position he does as a member of the bar, should have made such a remark that the men appointed as revising barristers would be appointed for partizan purposes, would always be partizans, and they would act as partizans as long as they held that position. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman, knowing as he does or ought to know the dignity and standing of the profession in Nova Scotia, should say that any man could be found in the profession that would act in the way he charges. If we take the act referred to

by my hon. friend from Amherst, passed by the local legislature, we will find that ts whole scope and object was against, and that it disfranchises, not men voting for themselves, but men who vote for Dominion elections. They attempted in that legislature to control the representation in the Dominion Parliament, as well as in the Local Assembly, and it is no wonder that this Parliament, urged by public sentiment, should have stepped in to counteract such an abuse of the rights and privileges of Parliament. Read this Bill without party prejudice, as everyone should do, and then it would not fail of convincing everybody that it is designed to secure the purity of our elections, and its cost is not to be weighed against the securing of such a boon—the return to parliament of the people's choice. I understand in some of the other provinces—I am thinking of Ontario—the reform party continue in power, by skill in manipulating and framing of franchises, and with the undisguised object of interfering with the Dominion Parliament, and bringing it into accord with their own views and wishes. I do not desire further to occupy the time of the House at this late hour, but I have failed as yet to find any reasonable or valid argument in opposition to this Bill. The hon. gentleman from DeLanaudiere, it seemed to me, felt so, as he was forced to construct and set up an image, for the purpose of knocking it down again. Three-fourths of his speech was with regard to woman suffrage, which is not thought of, which is not in the Bill, and to which nobody had referred. I have seen children playing hard in building up a snow-man for the purpose of knocking it down again. It is an illustration of the course of the hon. gentleman, who set up a fancy of his own simply to knock it down. As regards the expense of the machinery to carry out this Bill, I cannot conceive that it is going to be anything like what the hon. gentleman from Halifax and the other obstructers of this Bill say it is. The revising barrister takes the last electoral list of the constituency, and if that is not to be had he takes the last assessment roll. He does not manufacture the first list; but he takes the old one, and to that he adds the names of the voters qualified under this Bill, on the information he receives. The list is then open for correction and, if necessary, revision in court. After the first voters' list is perfected there is very little to be done year after year in revising or correcting it, and I cannot see or believe that in that there will be the expense that my hon. friend refers to. Hon. gentlemen have not been able to attack this Bill or to show that any class of people have been wronged or that any party who has been hitherto entitled to the franchise will be deprived of it. Every man in Prince Edward Island who now has a vote will hold his vote. We are not doing our duty as representatives of the people in this independent branch of the Legislature if we do not give what the constitution not only intended but did give to the people of this country, and which they directly demand through their members. If the constitution intended that this parliament should regulate the franchise—which it expressly does—no one can deny that we would be acting in a tyrannical manner, in fact we would be acting at the tip-top of our powers if we, whose seats are not affected, interfered with the expressed wish of the people as declared by their representatives, not by a close vote, but comparatively by an immense majority in Parliament assembled, in a matter which purely affects their own seats. I say it would be monstrous for a body like this, under such circumstances, to interfere with their constitution and peculiar rights and privileges in that way, and if we did so I should not be surprised at it creating such a storm of indignation throughout the country as to sweep us out of existence.

HON. MR. POWER—What about the Scott Act?

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I do not know what the Scott Act has to do with it, but I tell the hon. gentleman that, as to the petitions sent in against the Scott Act, the men who signed them were as numerous as those who petitioned in favor of it; and the Commons is much divided on it; and as to the opposition to this Bill, the people everywhere laugh at the obstruction tactics of hon. gentlemen, knowing that under responsible government the majority rule, and are responsible to the people, not to the Opposition, the minority. The Opposition not only

criticised this act of the Government, which they have a right to do, but they deliberately obstructed the business of Parliament and the ordinary affairs and duties of Parliament. Such a position was never contemplated by our constitution; but instead of gaining popularity by such conduct they have lessened themselves in public estimation by avowed obstruction, and instead of adding to their weight and strength they have only shown, by their opposition to this Bill, that they are conscious of their weakness and dare not approach the intelligent people of this country under a pure franchise bill and ask for a commendation of their conduct. It is now so late in the evening that I think it would be wearying the House if I went over the very large number of notes I have on my desk, taken of the speeches of those who preceded me. I think hon. gentlemen will be satisfied if I leave this subject now. I say again that there has never been a bill before Parliament that received more of my cordial approval than the measure now before us. As far as possible we should do away with provincialism in Dominion politics. It is a matter in which we ought to have uniformity. I always advocated one franchise, and it is a reproach to the Governments of the country which have allowed this want of uniformity so long to exist. As far as I have listened to the gentlemen opposed to this Bill they have not shown us that it is too wide or too contracted, they are not united on any grounds of attack and they cannot attack it upon any reasonable ground. They merely contend that because for a number of years we have allowed this privilege to remain in the hands of the Local Legislatures (who, we say, abused it,) that we should allow it to continue there, and that the revising barrister is sure to be a partizan. This Bill should be sustained by the unanimous vote of this House.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE—The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat attempted to make a strong point by attacking the hon. member from DeLanaudiere. He tried to make it appear that the hon. gentleman had set up a kind of Nebuchadnezzar's image, with feet of clay—a gaudy image with all kinds of curious materials worked into it—but for my part I could not see that the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg brought forward any valid argument to prove the indictment he laid against the hon. gentleman from DeLanaudiere. It seems to me that he failed altogether in his attempt to identify that hon. gentleman with a broken-down argument. The Minister of Justice in introducing the Bill made, as I thought, a very becoming speech, very much so indeed. It was a very quiet, and no doubt a very conclusive speech in the opinion of hon. gentlemen who are of his stripe of politics; but I cannot say that when the hon. gentleman had finished, he had reconciled any prejudices which existed in my mind against the Bill—on the contrary he seemed to strengthen them, when I came to understand that a gentleman of his great experience and ability had so very little strong, sound, convincing argument to produce in support of the Bill. He enlarged, as several gentlemen have done since, upon the beauty of the principle of uniformity. Certainly, uniformity is beautiful under some conditions and under some circumstances. The hon. gentleman spoke also of the beauty of symmetry. We acknowledge that also, but I myself am not of the opinion that this is a subject on which uniformity under all circumstances can be attained. Setting aside for a moment the case of the electoral franchises in British Columbia and Prince Edward Island where it has been abandoned, the principle of uniformity can hardly be enforced in a country of such enormous dimensions, and such diverse capabilities as this Dominion of ours. Unless there can be also a uniformity of values it is almost impossible to say that there can be a uniformity of franchise. A dollar, for instance, commands more labor on the shores of the Atlantic, in the eastern provinces, than on the shores of the Pacific, and if it were not so, would there be such abundant room for the employment of Chinese labor as there is now? and yet this principle of uniformity without reference to the value of money, or of property, or men, and general conditions of things, is insisted upon throughout the country. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues had so little confidence in their own darling principle of uniformity that they

actually let it slip through their fingers. When the pinch came, they found that that principle of the Bill was so offensive to at least two of the provinces of the Dominion that they had at once to abandon it, and away it went. The hon. gentleman, I think, in introducing this measure, spoke of the dissatisfaction which existed at the reduction of the franchise in some of the provinces, and denied that any plan existed by which the Government could derive any special advantages from the introduction of this Bill; but I do think that one conversant, as that hon. gentleman is, with law, and with constitutional rights, and with everything that becomes a free man, should not have lost sight altogether of the recognized right —recognized in amongst every English-speaking community—that once a free man, a man is always a free man; that in one way only can he be deprived of his rights as a free man, and that is if he disgraces himself, that is, if he is found guilty of bribery and corruption, and I know of no free man, who, having honestly used his privileges, has ever been deprived of those privileges by the vote of Parliament. If any such example does exist, I should like to know by whom and when it was introduced.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—In the Legislature of Nova Scotia; there was manhood suffrage in Nova Scotia, and it was afterwards restricted. I was returned in 1863 under manhood suffrage, and the next election after that, it was on assessment.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is a case in point.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I do not know whether Joseph Howe was living at that time.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—He was.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I do not think he could have been a party to the destruction of that franchise. If he was he was in opposition to all his written and spoken sentiments.

HON. MR. DICKEY—The Hon. Joseph Howe was the author of that Bill that took away manhood suffrage. I was in Parliament myself at the time.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Will the hon. gentleman say there was no reason for this?

HON. MR. DICKEY—I will not discuss it.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—It is quite possible that those men who had enjoyed the electoral franchise in Nova Scotia had in some way disgraced themselves. It may be that they were guilty of bribery and corruption, and I for one would be most reluctant to insult the memory of such a man as Howe by admitting for one moment that he could have been guilty deliberately of depriving men of the electoral franchise who had been guilty of no crime, and unless some better authority can be produced to demonstrate beyond the possibility of a doubt that such is the case I shall continue incredulous.

HON. MR. CARVELL—The member from Amherst and the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg notwithstanding.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Yes. However I may have a little more to say upon that point yet. We have had the merits of the revising barrister discussed, and I think from the Minister of Justice down, throughout his whole supporters here, we have had hon. gentlemen insisting on the great excellence of this scheme for allowing the appointment by the Government of the revising barrister, who is to decide upon the franchises of those who are to return their supporters to this Parliament. Perhaps no hon. gentleman went further in this regard than did the hon. gentleman from Amherst. He went to great lengths in affirming the beauty and excellence of the system, and I think the hon. gentleman who last spoke indulged in no little emphatic declamation as to the impossibility of any man who is a barrister in Nova Scotia so far forgetting himself as to allow political influence to have any effect on his decisions in his court. All I can say in that regard is that I would be the last man in the world to cast any reflection upon any of those honorable professions. We were accus-

tomed in the country from which I come to call theirs one of the three learned professions, and they enjoyed certain privileges which other professions did not, and we always looked upon them as being men of the highest honor and highest integrity; but I do not say that the legal profession is immaculate. It was held here a few days ago that men of another learned profession (the medical) were not to be trusted with certain duties which were allotted to them with reference to another act of Parliament, and it was almost decided—in fact I think it went to the vote here—whether or not a medical gentleman should be tried for certain offences before two justices of the peace. We had a division in this House the other day upon that very point. Now I say *prima facie* we had as much right to expect the gentlemen of the medical profession to be immaculate and irreproachable in this and all other matters as the gentlemen of the bar. I think that the members of the three learned professions should be held as highly honorable and untainted men; but unfortunately the way the world goes at present you can hardly venture to claim that of any profession; and we know besides this that governments will appoint men of that sort to positions who are in favor of their own views. In this matter confidence is essential, and the people whose rights those barristers are charged with, having no voice in their appointment, will have very little confidence in their decisions. The Minister of Justice spoke of voters going before a court constituted as the court is under this Bill as quite an easy, every-day affair for the residents of an electoral district; but I do not think if that is really his opinion, and I presume it is, that he is very familiar with the way the ordinary countryman thinks upon an event of this sort. The establishment of his vote, and the giving of his vote, are important events in that man's life. Perhaps he may be very reluctant, if he is a man of retiring habits and thoughts, to go before the public and establish the fact that he is worth so much money, and that he is entitled to his vote. He has very little hesitation indeed about going before a body of his own neighbors who are acquainted with his circumstances, and who are men of integrity in whom he has confidence.

HON. MR. PLUMB—He has only to show that he is worth enough to qualify him. He need not show how much he is worth, or what is the actual value of his property.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—The fact remains, that generally a voter has no difficulty and no hesitation about going before a court of which he has a voice in the selection, the personnel of which he is acquainted with, and on whose integrity he can rely. He can go before a court of that kind with confidence and state his case with confidence. He does not require legal advice. He can plead his case with confidence himself; but when you send down from Ottawa, or from any other place, a barrister of whom he knows nothing, and whom he is inclined to suspect because he is appointed by the Government, and he knows that the Government want to have a majority in his district—I say that that man has good reason for hesitating before appearing before such a court, and for not having confidence in such a court. I am not going to insist upon the fact that upright barristers may not possibly be appointed. There are barristers, and barristers; and there are some upon whose character no blemish can be cast, but there are others who, without any blemish on their characters, are simply partizans, and there is nothing in this bill to prevent the Government from appointing a partizan. I believe myself that it is the very object of this Bill. I believe the very point insisted upon by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa is the real and unjust one—that the very object of this Bill is to put the matter strongly under the control of the Government.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, no, no.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—The hon. gentleman says "no, no," but I will tell him a lesson I have learned during the time I have been in public life. I did not commence my political education perhaps quite so early as the hon. gentleman did. I had gray hairs before I entered upon politics; but I took good care to study the question as closely as I could and to consult the best authorities. I have always made it my study in framing legislation

here that we should anticipate that the parties against whose action we are about to guard are disposed to break the law. We are to suppose that those barristers will not be immaculate men, but that they will be just the contrary, and if we do our duty here we will put it beyond the power of any such men to do any mischief whatever. That is, I conceive, the first grand principle of legislation which every gentleman ought to apply to each law as it comes before this body. We ought to hold that instead of men being disposed to observe the law, that they will be disposed to break the law and to take advantage of it in every way they possibly can; and therefore it should be our endeavour to place no temptations in their way, or opportunity to do mischief in the position in which they are placed. It seems to be inevitable that if you put a man in a certain position of trust you expose him to this temptation, and I say it is unwise, and unstatesmanlike to do so. Have we not the experience of the Mother Country to guide us in this matter? There are gentlemen in this House sitting all around me as far advanced in life as I am myself, who must still have a keen recollection of the passing of the first Reform Bill; and I can recollect the first voters list being posted up against the parish church doors as provided by that law. I can recollect the revising barristers appointed by the judges of the Courts of Assize, performing the very duties which we are now about to place in the hands of the nominee of the Government; and yet with all this experience available for us, the experience that this plan devised by Brougham and Russell, and Althorp affords—this plan which has met the approval of the men who have had registered voters' lists for 50 years and more, is set at naught and considered worthless by the Government of Canada. I think it is a matter of regret that any attempt of this kind should have been made. We have had this Bill three years before the legislature, and the suspicions of the people respecting it have been lulled to sleep by the length of time it has been allowed to remain on the tables of Parliament without action having been taken upon it. I did not myself believe at the commencement of the session that it would be proceeded with. It was not at all generally believed or thought of that any part of the labors of this session would be in connection with the Franchise Bill.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend is mistaken there.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I may be wrong, but such is my belief, that when hon. gentleman met here this year they thought the session would be a very short one, and that certainly could not be the case if they knew that a Bill of this kind was to be brought up.

HON. MR. CARVELL—We are not taken by surprise at all.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—No, not at all. I would for a moment detain the House by comparing the complicated machinery of this Bill with the simplicity of the system that prevails in Prince Edward Island. There we have no revising courts; every man of 21 years of age who has performed his statute labor or paid commutation for it, is competent to vote at elections. Here is the question decided in the most simple, uniform and inexpensive way. That it worked well and favourably is clear from the fact that it has been at least 30 years in operation in our province.

HON. MR. PLUMB—You are a very exemplary moral people there.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Honest farmers.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—They are not, I think, any more exemplary than other people are; but it seems to me—replying to the remark which has just been cast across the floor at me—that if the people elsewhere are immoral we ought to make some effort to improve them. If it be so that there is a large portion of the population of Canada, of the older provinces, who are unfit to exercise the electoral franchise, someone is to blame for that. Either you have neglected their education, or you have neglected them in some other way; otherwise there ought to be no large proportion of the people in such a country as Canada who are unfit to exercise the franchise. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman, who is so

exceedingly well read and learned, and who picks up everything that can bear on political questions, has sometime or other thought of the remark of Mr. Lowe on the passing of the Reform Bill in 1860, "These are our masters, come let us educate them!" Have we done that in Canada? If we have, there is no reason to be afraid of the town population; if not we have been remiss in our duty. It is true that there are a few foreigners imported as immigrants but their numbers are small, and it not unfrequently happens that they are amongst the best people we have, and if occasionally there are a few *mauvaise sujets* amongst them, that you must expect to find in any community, and their numbers would be insignificant compared with the number of voters that manhood suffrage would bring to the polls.

HON. MR. POWER called attention to the fact that it was midnight and suggested that the debate should be adjourned.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE moved the adjournment of the debate.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 12 o'clock (midnight).

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Friday, July 10th 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

EIGHTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

HON. MR. READ, from the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament, presented their eighth report. He said: I beg to say that it is not expected that this report will be taken into consideration, as in the other House it has been sent back to the Committee for reconsideration. I move that the report be taken into consideration on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

SECOND READING.

The order of the day having been called for

Resuming debate on the Hon. Mr. Scott's motion in amendment to the Hon. Sir Alex. Campbell's motion for the second reading of Bill (103) respecting the Electoral Franchise, viz.:—"That the said Bill be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months."

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE said: It will be in the recollection of the House that in the course of my remarks yesterday evening I had occasion to allude to certain changes in the electoral law, and I stated my impression that there was no instance on record of the abolition of a body of freeholders, whereupon my hon. friend from Amherst interrupted me by saying there was such an instance in Nova Scotia, and I, perhaps very improperly and hastily, declined to accede to his statement. In fact I expressed my incredulity. On consideration I am not now surprised to find that my hon. friend is a little offended with my statements All I have to say is that for any remarks of mine which had the effect of offending the hon. gentleman I am heartily sorry, and I am ready, and most willingly without any arrière pensée withdraw them, and I do so with the greater readiness and satisfaction because I have had an opportunity of ascertaining that the hon. gentleman himself, in his place in the Nova Scotia Parliament, opposed the abolition of the franchise referred to, with all the ability in his power, and for that reason I can easily understand that all the facts of the case are very firmly impressed on his mind, and therefore with my hon. friend's permission I ask him to accept this explanation of the rudeness I committed last evening.

It may be in the recollection of the House that last night, before the adjournment, I was contrasting the great simplicity of the electoral franchise which had existed so many years in Prince Edward Island, with that which it is sought to esta-

blish by this Bill, and I think the hon. gentleman from Niagara had made some suggestion across the floor which led me to say that perhaps Ontario was somewhat to blame if she was afraid to trust the people with manhood suffrage or anything approaching thereto—that perhaps she had not fully educated her people. That may be so or not; I simply refer to it for the purpose of taking up the thread of my address. Perhaps the most incisive and most formidable speech which was made on the question was that of the hon. gentleman from Niagara. He stated very positively and in very strong incisive language, several propositions. There was one to this effect, that the action of the Opposition in another place had been very unusual and very uncalled for; that a deliberate attempt was made by the minority to choke down the majority; and that the action of the Opposition had actually caused a paralysis of the public business, and he also told us that the Opposition would have gained more by tem perate and reasonable opposition than has already been gained. These are some very positive and very precise statements, but unfortunately for the hon. gentleman's argument he made another statement which is entirely opposed to the former, so that if one class of assertions is correct the other must be wrong. He made this statement also that every one of the amendments to the bill was agreed to in caucus before the bill was brought down.

Hon. Mr PLUMB—No; decidedly not.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE—Does the hon. gentleman say he did not make that statement?

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—Not in that form.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE—Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to correct me if I am wrong.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—I did not say before the bill was brought down, because that would have been an absurdity. I said during the progress of the bill and in anticipation; and I said if the gentlemen who were opposing it had opposed it in the ordinary manner of a constitutional opposition they would have got all their amendments that they wanted, and would have got them without the necessity of detaining Parliament for two or three months.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE—Did not the hon. gentleman say that these amendments to the bill had been agreed to in caucus?

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—Certainly.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE—Is that statement compatible with the previous one to which I have called the attention of the House?

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—I do not see any discrepancy.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE—I say they are not. I say if the one statement is correct the other cannot be correct.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—Of course the hon. gentleman knows enough about parliamentary matters to be aware that I would not be expected to know exactly what passed in a caucus of the House of Commons that I did not attend, but I say that is the statement which has been given to me, and I only give it as far as I know, and I also say that the two statements are not at all incompatible.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE—The hon. gentleman's zeal, on this occasion, rather carried away his discretion. I thought at the time that the hon. gentleman was somewhat indiscreet in referring to transactions that occurred in a party caucus at all. I have always understood, myself, that the proceedings in caucus are generally held to be confidential, and when the hon. gentleman made that statement I saw at once that it was utterly incompatible with the fact that the Reform party in the other House had made a factious opposition, which is certainly not the case. If the hon. gentleman had listened attentively to the address of the hon. member who spoke from the seat behind him (Mr. Bellerose) he would certainly have heard that gentleman's

opinion of the amended Bill as contrasted with the Bill as brought in. That hon. gentleman expressed his satisfaction with the improvements in the Bill, so far as it went, but he said it was still one he could not support. It must be, I think, a very small matter for congratulation to the Government to see that some highly independent members among their usual supporters are dropping quietly away from them on this occasion. It shows the inherent badness of this Bill, and I think if the hon. gentleman had bestowed that attention on the address of the hon. gentleman from DeLanaudiere which it deserved he would hardly have spoken in the way he did of the action of the Opposition in the House of Commons. As for that statement of his that the Opposition would have gained more by reasonable and temperate criticism than they have gained as it is, all I can say is it is not too late now to give those additional advantages which, he says, we might have gained by more temperate language and language more satisfactory to his party and friends. If there is anything held back, it is not too late to give it to us : let us have it by all means. I felt it necessary to express my opinion upon those parts of the hon. gentleman's speech, because he himself certainly put about as much force into them as, I think, he is capable of, and, no doubt, he did good service to his friends, and to the Bill itself. His speech was an able and powerful one, but I think there is an answer to that part of it at all events. But there is another portion of the hon. gentleman's speech to which I can refer with unmixed satisfaction. I listened with great pleasure to the hon. gentleman's statement respecting the Indians of Canada. It was a most interesting and gratifying statement, and all I can say is it was only impaired by the last remark which the hon. gentleman made on that subject. After having told us to what degree of civilization the Indians on these reserves had reached, and having told us of their successful agriculture, of their beautiful and well furnished houses, of their tasteful music, of their acacquirements in the arts, and in other ways—

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—They have two splendid brass bands ; they play splendidly.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE—I was just about to refer to their taste for music, which the hon. gentleman informed us of. Having asserted that these men were fully fit to exercise the rights of free men, he admitted at once that there was one point on which they could not be trusted as other men are—that is they could not, if I understood him, be trusted with the administration of their own affairs ; that in money matters they could not be trusted to look after their own interests ; that in point of fact they still require a trustee. I think that these are, if not the *ipsissima verba* which the hon. gentleman used, the tenor of his remarks about the Indians. I say they were exceedingly satisfactory and interesting but they lack one thing—they lack the important point that these Indians, civilized as they were described in all other respects, were not able to take care of their own property. It seems to me that it is almost blameable in a party that have been in power so many years as this Government have been, to allow these Indians to remain in this highly civilized state without doing anything for them. It seems to me that the remains of these nations of Indians which have arrived at this pitch of civilization should have come to their friends in Parliament to be emancipated from all thraldom ; that they should have been admitted into the comity of colonies and made a real part of the Dominion. That I think was the natural course to pursue, and had that course been pursued four or five years ago, and had those Indians been living amongst us showing that they were competent and willing to take part in the government of the country and to share in the responsibility of citizenship, as white men do, then we could very fairly and properly have expressed our willingness to adopt, as free men among ourselves, those who are willing to share our responsibility ; but as I say, and as the hon. gentleman informed us, these Indians lack one important feature which was to qualify them—that is, that they could not take care of their own affairs ; that they needed a trustee yet, and if so, that man must exercise great influence on their thoughts, feelings and actions in the crisis of a general election. I am assuming that the Indian of Ontario generally is as

described by the hon. gentleman. I am not going to gainsay that fact at all ; I am not personally acquainted with that subject, but I know in our own province the Indians are very different indeed to the Ontario Indians as described by the hon. gentleman. I have been brought in contact with Indians in Prince Edward Island officially in the course of my political life, and I know they were always a source of the greatest anxiety to the Government. We always felt that the treatment of the Indians was a chronic trouble, that with the best intentions our views were almost invariably defeated. The Aborigines Protection Society of London had purchased an island for those people. Before that we had nothing in the shape of a reserve on Prince Edward Island, but when this society became aware of their position they purchased an island off the north shore of Prince Edward Island, and it was vested in the Lieutenant Governor and President of Executive Council as Trustees. It was the intention and wish of the Government and Legislature of that Province for years to induce men to do what the hon. gentleman says the Indian of Canada has done. I am speaking now of events which occurred years ago, and I am sorry to admit that our efforts have been so comparatively unsuccessful, for I fear it is the case in the Island Province that there are very few if any Indians to whom it would be justifiable to commit so important a trust as the elective franchise. For myself I may say that I have known but one in that province whom I should consider competent to exercise this privilege. Nevertheless, I do think that the statement which the hon. gentleman made is highly interesting and at the proper time and place it might be put to an exceedingly useful purpose. I wish to refer to an episode in this debate in which Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone's names were introduced in connection with the statement made by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa. I think some misapprehension prevails there. My hon. friend, if I am not mistaken, in speaking of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone, referred not to the revising officer but to the redistribution Bill, and if I mistake not also I had called the hon. gentleman's attention to the subject not many days before, contrasting the happy way in which the English Government and Parliament had carried into effect a gigantic redistribution Bill, with what is known in Canada as the gerrymandering Bill. Here in Canada, Ontario became entitled to, I think, four additional members, and in order to find them suitable constituencies the whole province was cut up and broken into shreds, and a very bad impression was raised throughout the Dominion that all this had been done with an object. It is not the time or place to debate that at present ; I simply want to put this matter on its right footing. The hon. gentleman referred to the action of the Imperial Parliament and Government upon this question, and I will read a few lines which show the kind of spirit in which that re-adjustment was carried out in the old country and what the rival parties thought of the manner in which it had been done. On June 9th, the *Times* wrote upon it in this manner, referring to the opinion expressed the day before by Lord Salisbury. The *Times* says :—

"It would be unjust to attribute the comparatively easy passage of the Bill through both Houses of Parliament solely to the agreement arrived at beforehand between the leaders of the two great parties. This agreement applied only to principles, and the Bill is essentially a matter of detail. For the adjustment of these details with skill, impartiality and success, infinite credit is due to the members of the boundary Commission, to whose labors a high tribute was justly paid by Lord Salisbury yesterday. 'He never knew a public body,' he said, 'which performed so difficult a task in so short a time and with such general satisfaction ;' and this judgment will be endorsed by all competent politicians without distinction of party.''

Now, I think it must be admitted that we did not conduct these affairs in Canada with the same spirit of fairness and success in which a much larger undertaking was conducted in Great Britain. This is a point which I wish to bring to the notice of the House and explain the position which was taken by my hon. friend, a position which I think is unassailable. I have heretofore been speaking principally of remarks which occurred in the course of this debate. I wish to make a few remarks now with reference to the position of Prince Edward Island as to this measure. It is well known to this House—the House indeed has reason to know—that the Island has enjoyed for a number of years a

franchise nearly equal to manhood suffrage. Every man who arrives at 21 years of age and has performed statute labor in the vicinity, or paid the commutation equivalent to it, is entitled at the next election to vote, whether for members of the Local Legislature or for members of the Dominion Parliament. I think it must have been about the year 1874 or 1875 that a Bill was brought into Parliament respecting the Election law by the Mackenzie Government. That law required the existence of registration courts. It appears that in all parts or the Dominion except Prince Edward Island such courts already existed, but in the Island we had none. Our franchise required none, and we were happily without them, but the Government of the day were unwilling to establish courts at the expense of the Dominion in the Island, because they said—and I dare say very properly—that it would be used as a precedent for charging the expense of registration courts all over the Dominion on the Dominion treasury, and for that reason they refused to bear the cost of establishing registration courts in the Island. Meantime the local Government had given a sort of undertaking that such courts should be established: but some delay occurred in establishing them, and meanwhile the Bill passed through the other Chamber and came up here with a clause which disfranchised a large number of voters in Prince Edward Island. It directed that in any election until registration courts should be established the electorate should be that of the legislative council of the Island, which was a body voting upon an estate valued at, I think, £200 old currency. But still it would have had the effect of excluding a very large number of voters. Since that time some changes have occurred in the Senators from the Island: one gentleman who sat amongst us for a number of years has since been appointed Lieutenant Governor of the Island. He was not content to allow this disfranchisement to take place. I am not sure myself whether another hon. gentleman who still sits amongst us was not foremost in the same cause. For my own part, I know that I was absent in another place at the time, but returning here and finding the state of affairs I gave all the support I could to these senators who were endeavoring to prevent the disfranchisement of the Island voters. Accordingly an amendment to that clause was moved in this House, and I recollect well the arguments that were made upon it. Many hon. members were opposed to the principle of universal or manhood suffrage, but they said: "In this case we find men of all parties agreeing—men who had acted as leaders of the Opposition and men who had acted as leaders of the Government united to demand protection for these voters." It is not at all surprising to find that the House immediately coincided with that view. The amendment was carried; the bill was sent down to the House of Commons and came back with the amendment accepted. That is a simple and concise history of the Island question as it occurred here some ten years ago. We find the Government adopting and acting upon the very principle which I contended for yesterday, that once a freeman a man is always to be a freeman, unless, indeed, he forfeits his privileges by bribery or corruption in some form or other. They recognized this and actually consented to break through their darling principle of uniformity sooner than incur the responsibility which would have attended the breaking up of the franchise as existing in Prince Edward Island. I must say, hon. gentlemen, and I must express my opinions clearly about this, that it seems to me the Government had a very mean appreciation of the feelings and principles of the people of Prince Edward Island when they thought to satisfy them with such a trifle as this, in lieu of the liberal franchise which they had before. Did the Government think to satisfy them with enjoyment during their lives of a franchise which they could not transmit to their sons, and which any stranger who might come to settle amongst them could not share? It seems to me they must have formed the meanest opinion of the people of Prince Edward Island, and let me tell hon. gentlemen such an opinion is altogether undeserved; for although I am not a native of that island and shall always entertain a warm feeling for the place of my birth, yet that is the place in which I have expended my life's labour, and the people there I know have the very highest sense of honor on a matter of this sort, and you cannot deprive them or their sons of such a privilege and expect that

these men will sit down content under such a stigma. Hon. gentlemen might have learned a lesson from the representatives of that island in the other House. The member for Queen's was willing to take all he could from the Government, but still desiring to get something better he deserted his party and voted with the opposition on the amendment moved by the hon. member from King's county. For this I give him all praise : he acted like an honorable son of the soil as all these gentlemen did. There are men here like myself who have lived their lives there and reared their families on the island and feel very much in the same way. We do not want to see any man there deprived of any right he enjoyed, and which he hoped and believed he would transmit along with his property to his sons and relations. I claim, therefore, that those concessions, so called, although they involve a breach of the uniform principle, are very inadequate concessions to the people of Prince Edward Island, with which they are not at all likely to be contented. I intend, on the third reading of this Bill, to move an amendment as nearly as possible identical with that which was moved in the other House of Parliament, and supported by all the island members, without reference to party, and I shall claim of this hon. House that they shall do on the third reading of this Bill what the Senate did some ten years ago, when they saved the franchise of Prince Edward Island from only temporary destruction : this is permanent destruction. We do not know the hour or day that the danger we once incurred shall be permanent. This is a far greater danger, but be it great or small what I say is this, that it is the duty of all members of Parliament, and all patriotic men to watch and guard their political rights and privileges with the greatest care and caution. Let me, while I am on this subject, refer to a few illustrations from English history. Looking at the pages of Sir Thomas Erskine May, I have read with the greatest interest what he has said of the origin of English liberties. I wish my treacherous memory would enable me to give those sentences without reference to the paper before me, but I am obliged to confess that my memory is not perhaps what it has been in former years : so, perhaps the House will pardon me while I read a few sentences from the pages of Sir Thomas Erskine May. He says :—

"That Englishmen have been qualified for the enjoyment of political freedom, is mainly due to those ancient local institutions by which they have been trained to self government."

"The affairs of the people have been administered, not in Parliament only, but in the vestry, in the town council, the board meeting, and the Court of Quarter Sessions. England alone, among the nations of the earth, has maintained for centuries a constitutional polity ; and her liberties may be ascribed, above all things to her free local institutions ! "

"Since the days of their Saxon ancestors, her sons have learned at their own gates, the duties and responsibilities of citizens."

"Associating, for the common good, they have become exercised in public affairs."

"Thousands of small communities have enjoyed the privileges of self government, taxing themselves, through their representatives for local objects; meeting for discussion and business, and animated by local rivalries and ambitions."

These are the terms in which Sir Thomas Erskine May speaks of the origin of British freedom, and just so long as this freedom was carefully watched and guarded and preserved, just so long it remained intact : but when the time came that wealth and business and other causes led men to delegate to others the powers which their forefathers had exercised in person, these liberties came to be less carefully watched than they ought to have been and the consequence was—as we have most of us read in our histories—that this boasted municipal freedom which was the nurse and guardian of English liberty had dissappeared almost entirely, and had become a nest of corruption in the days of the Stuarts and further along indeed up to our own time. Those municipal institutions which in early Saxon times had been the seats of liberty had in our times become the seats of corruption. And how did this come about? Simply by relaxing this watchfulness which if it had been preserved would have saved those institutions from ruin. I ask hon. gentlemen is not this a lesson for ourselves if we admit for a moment that these municipal privileges of ours, these noble enfranchisements should be interfered with by a Government measure of this kind, but can we say we are content to allow the Government to establish a court for the registration of

voters among ourselves, a thing we can do better, more cheaply, and more satisfactorily to ourselves in every way—if we admit this, we admit at once the commencement of this insidious destruction which befell the English municipalities. Hon. gentlemen know perfectly well that amidst the municipal corruption of many of our cities there remained no voters at all. There was a mayor and aldermen and perhaps a common council and they carried on all the municipal affairs. When these bodies required renewal, by death or resignation of any of their members, the appeal was not to the people, but to the rest of the body, and the rest of the body elected men like themselves; and thus this state of things was perpetuated—the very same danger that my hon. friends are warning the Government of in this Bill. We say there is a danger in this Bill of perpetuating the majority in the House of Commons, and we warn you against doing anything which may have the effect of perpetuating in that body any dominant party. Are we right or are we wrong? Have we reason or precedent on our side? Does not our history confirm this statement? Can it be denied for one moment? I perhaps may find it answered because I was rather shortly stopped yesterday in making a bold assertion, but I believe it is the case that scarcely any country possesses this unbroken municipal franchise. I know that in Hungary the patriotic Kossuth claimed that the same system remained in his country and had kept liberty alive all those years up to a recent period, and there is some shadow of it existing there still even up to this time.

HON. MR PLUMB—It prevails in Russia.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I believe it prevailed in Switzerland too, but that was owing perhaps more to the inaccessible situation of that country than to any other cause. They gained their liberties; how? By constant watchfulness. But, dropping ancient history and foreign history, let us speak of our own. What has happened here in Canada? Did not the Dominion the other day pass her eighteenth birthday, and has she not, I may say without danger of contradiction, fairly well performed all the duties of a nation during that time? She has put down foreign invasions—met them on her own borders, and within her own territories, and defeated them. Has she not quelled rebellion? She has, but yet I think we have to look to a much earlier period—a period much further back in the history of the British colonies to understand the important point how it is the love of liberty has sprung up amongst us, and how it has been nurtured, and how it has grown. To understand all this, I think, we must look back to the earlier history of our British colonies—in speaking of one we must speak of them all. No doubt the Mother Country gave to most of her colonies as much if not more freedom than she herself possessed. She gave us representative institutions, sometimes interrupted by nominated councils for a time; but there was always an appeal to the people themselves; liberties were not abrogated by any insidious acts of the Government appointed by the people. Their liberties were increasing rather than diminishing yearly, and such is the process going on through all the colonies. I know that in my own province we battled for a hundred years, that sometimes we contended against the operation of the proprietary tenure of land, sometimes for representative institutions, and finally obtained them. The British Government gave us all that she had to give—all she knew at that time. Since then there has been a great development of what we now understand as Parliamentary government in England, but I think it has not reached further than it has here. Here we are quite as jealous of our liberties and our constitutional government as they are in the Mother Land, and, I think, it is to this struggle for parliamentary government—for parliamentary responsible government—that we owe the great love of liberty which prevails throughout this Dominion, and it is to that love of liberty, that high estimation and regard in which our rights and liberties are held, that we must look to obviate the evil effects of this Bill should it become law. I have to tender my thanks to the House for the great patience with which they have listened to my remarks. I am aware that for some cause or other unknown to me, there is a desire that a division should take place on

this Bill this evening, and I am not willing to incur the denunciations of the hon. gentleman from Niagara, who might think, perhaps, I am becoming factious in my opposition and unnecessarily tedious in my remarks. So I will endeavor to draw them to a close. Some apprehension perhaps exists on the part of gentlemen who form the Opposition in and out of Parliament, that the tendency of this Bill is dangerous; that it is one which will place much parliamentary power at the disposal of the present Government, and thus maintain them permanently in office, and, I believe, there is danger of that; but I deduce another conclusion from it different from that which some people do. I draw conclusions rather favorable to the advancement of reform principles. I believe, myself, that the Government and their friends began to be aware of the certain advance of reform principles in the country; that they began to get rather fearful as to whether they would be able to maintain their position, and hence this Bill which has been kept hanging over Parliament and the country for three years, and now it is found that a crisis has arrived, and that action must be taken if they are to preserve their position. While hon. gentlemen are reduced to that last resource, I say go on and make your intentions known to the country, and you will find that your expectations will be disappointed; that the people see through and through your design and will defeat this—I was going to say illegitimate object: I do not think the term would be altogether inappropriate—this illegitimate object at the polls. I shall say a few words before I conclude respecting the farmer's son franchise. It seems to me that that franchise is not altogether so worthy of praise as some hon. gentlemen have thought. It contrasts very unfavorably with the position of farmers' sons in my own province, as regards their obtaining votes. There they obtained the vote without reference to the farm at all, and without reference to the father; but by this Bill as it stands, the farmer must qualify the son or sons, and if it is not of sufficient value, however competent the sons may be, they can not become qualified from that source. The man has labored on his father's farm all his life; he may become a very estimable character in the community, but may have very little money, and if he has to look to the farm for qualifications he may, in many instances, look in vain. He may even be disappointed when he comes to obtain this expected franchise from the farm. It may turn out, on inquiry, that the farm was not of the value anticipated. It may be intrinsically of the value required, but the owner may not be in full possession of it. He may possibly have never paid for it, or it is encumbered, and although the sons be perfectly competent under this law to become voters, they are disappointed. This is a great objection to it. You make the enfranchisement of the farmer's sons depend on the value of the farm, whereas the enfranchisement of the sons should depend upon their own fitness for the position. So much has already been said upon the revising barrister clauses that I do not think it is necessary to go into it any further. I have a decided objection to the system. I always regret to see the direct actions of governments in affairs which can be managed in another way. It seems to me that if the Government had followed the English precedent, and allowed their revising barristers—if they were determined that they would have revising barristers—to be appointed by the judges of the Supreme Court in their respective provinces, they would then have carried with them the confidence of the people, and I think no reflection could then have been cast upon those gentlemen on the score of their appointment. Whether they are actually fit for the duty, whether they are altogether candid and fair or not, suspicion will always attach to them, and it is a very objectionable thing that suspicion should attach to any judge. An hon. gentleman on the other side of the House (Mr. Plumb), speaking upon this point, told us that there was an appeal against the judge, an appeal to Parliament; that a judge who misconducted himself could be removed on an appeal to Parliament. This is a very good, a very safe, a very wholsome regulation as regards a criminal or common law judge; but I venture to suggest that it is a very improper and unsuitable arrangement when it relates to the appointment of a political judge. Hon. gentlemen know perfectly well, and no one knows better than the Minister of Justice, that

the action of Parliament both in Canada and Great Britian for many years past has been to remove all such cases out of Parliament and to place them before the courts. Why? Because they recognized the principle that men cannot act independently and fairly in cases where they are themselves concerned; and when an appeal comes before Parliament in the shape of a petition for the removal of such a judge, that is, in fact an election case—when such a case as that comes before Parliament we say at once that Parliament is incompetent to judge it fairly. That principle has been recognized over and over again in Great Britain, and it has been recognized in Canada as well, where we had for many years past removed all such cases before the courts, and have derived the greatest benefit and satisfaction from doing so. I therefore attach little importance to the liability of the revising barrister or judges to Parliamentary appeal. I am sorry to have detained the House as long as I have done, knowing the anxiety of hon. gentlemen to proceed with this business; I therefore tender you my thanks for your courtesy, and resume my seat.

Hon. Mr. GOWAN—I feel that it is a great pleasure to take part in this debate, seeing that it has been conducted from the first and throughout with a spirit of fairness and calmness that perhaps does not always find a place even in this Assembly. I was greatly gratified to hear the hon. gentleman from Queen's county speak in the terms in which he did of the Minister of Justice, as I am sure every hon. member in this House was also. The spirit of fairness and of candor which seems to be a part, the very essence of his nature on all subjects the Minister of Justice deals with, quite assures me that the remarks that the hon. gentleman made were entirely deserved, and find an echo in the heart of every hon. gentleman in this House. If the hon. gentleman from Queen's county will permit me to say as much, I think he himself is conspicuous for much that he attributed to the hon. Minister of Justice. I have never heard him speak in a way that did not commend itself to me as the honest utterance of a man of strong convictions, willing to do justice to the arguments of those who are opposed to him, and desirous of reaching truth. I am not bold enough to stand up for the purpose of answering the remarks that have been made by the hon. gentleman from Queen's county. I would not dare venture to break a lance with him, knowing how expert he is in all matters of debate, and what a vast amount of knowledge he brings to bear on every subject he touches; but there are one or two points that he referred to upon which I would venture to say a word. He referred with great admiration to some recollections of his early life in connection with the revising barrister system which prevails at home, and he referred with great admiration to Lord Brougham a great and noble man, and seemed to convey the idea that this measure was not exactly in accordance with the principles that Lord Brougham advocated and maintained throughout his whole public life. I might venture to say, with regard to myself, that I am also, and have been ever since I could reason, an humble admirer of Lord Brougham, and in 1843, at the time when I was appointed to a new District, and when it became the duty of the judge to appoint the seals for the courts over which he presided, I ventured to take a new departure, and the seal design I gave for my courts was the head of Lord Brougham, and to this day that seal is still in use in the courts over which I formerly presided. As I feel as warmly attached to the memory of that great man, and as I as fully, perhaps, adopt the principles and views advocated by him as the hon. gentleman from Queen's, I may venture to point out to him wherein I think he has perhaps misconceived the effect of this measure. Lord Brougham was not in favor of centralization—complete centralization; neither was he in favor of decentralization, and of the two he regarded more evils were likely to arise from the system of complete decentralization than from the system of centralization. The hon. gentleman from Queen's will recollect that at the time of that very important debate connected with the tribunals which are now all over England and Ireland, under the county court system, Lord Brougham entered very fully into the question, and spoke of the evils arising from the multiplicity of jurisdictions which prevailed all over the British Isles: numerous courts with separate jurisdictions managed by

agents, not acting upon uniform principles, and inaugurated, many of them, upon the vote of municipalities. The system that he devised, the county court system, was intended to remedy that evil, and at the same time it avoided the evils on the other hand that arose from complete centralization. Now, I shall presently show, and the main object of my speaking on this occasion is to point out from actual knowledge of the practical working for many years where evils arise, under the present system for the preparation of voters' lists in Ontario, and I think that the parallel between the courts that existed at the time the county court system was devised in England, and the various bodies or agencies that now exist, for the purpose of preparing voters' lists in Ontario—perhaps the best system in any Province, is perfectly correct. Upon that point, therefore, I do not think that the hon. gentleman from Queen's County can invoke the opinion of Lord Brougham as being at all opposed to the measure now before the House, for it has, I think, the advantage of reasonable decentralization, without the disadvantage of the ramification and detail, which is a weakness in itself, and under which last, the duties are scarcely ever efficiently and properly performed. There was another point upon which the hon. gentleman for Queen's dilated, and I thought perhaps a little ungraciously. It was in respect to Prince Edward Island and the concession of the Government—not departing from the principle of the Bill, for they have not departed from the principle of it—but in making that concession which will secure to the men of the day the privileges of the franchise which they now enjoy. I admit that the Bill would have been more symmetrical if it had not been modified to that extent; but it does not affect the principle of the Bill at all. It is a measure which enlarges existing rights, and does not disfranchise anyone. The concession I repeat does not touch the principle of the Bill. The whole basis of this measure was to enlarge the franchise to give to those who had it not the right to vote, to embrace every one who could fairly be embraced, and therefore it would not be in accordance with the principle of the Bill if these men in British Columbia and Prince Edward Island who already have the franchise were deprived of it, but it is certainly not an inconsistent thing to say that we will preserve the franchise to the men of to-day, but will not allow the principle of the Bill to be interfered with. We will save existing rights, and say in the language that the hon. gentleman has used, once a free man always a free man—they have preserved to those free men the right and privileges they enjoy, but they have still retained the principle of the Bill. I think it is in Virginia that letters are attached to the names of distinguished families—F. F. V.—"first family in Virginia," I believe is the meaning of it. It will be something if certain persons in Prince Edward Island, will be able to attach to their names L.V. P.E.I., that is "life voters of Prince Edward Island." The hon. gentleman from DeLanaudiere touched upon one or two points that greatly interested me, and I was exceedingly gratified with his very able dissertation on one branch of the subject I entirely agree with him. Of course the hon. gentleman had the right to enter upon the subject, but whether it was necessary to do so at such length was another question, but I may say upon that point as well as upon the question of manhood suffrage I entirely agree with him. The main point he seemed to dwell upon was that this action was uncalled for except pressing reasons for it prevailed. Now it is the part of wise legislators and wise Governments, not to wait until the evil arises but to anticipate the possibility of an evil arising and guard against it. I will suppose a case in which the evil might at once arise, which I am sure would arouse the hon. gentleman from DeLanaudiere into a perfect frenzy of feeling. We will suppose in Ontario, for example, that the legislature forgetful of what is a right in my opinion, enacted that no one should be allowed to vote except he could read intelligently in the English language certain clauses in the British North America Act. In my part of the country there is a very large settlement of French Canadians and many of them are incapable of uttering a word in English, and certainly they cannot read the English language. I can imagine, if such a matter as that arose, the hon. gentleman with all the vivacity of his race, and all the energy of his nature getting into a perfect frenzy of indignation

as I myself might do if in Lower Canada it was enacted that no one should have a right to vote except he could speak and write in the French language. I would consider that exceedingly unfair towards the people who speak my own language, and I would be perhaps quite as indignant as the hon. gentleman. That is a remote contingency, and I only mention it incidentally; it is not at all likely to occur; but suppose female suffrage introduced in any province what would the hon. gentleman with his strong feeling on the subject think? Why of course he would feel strongly and express himself strongly on that point, and I rejoice with him that that clause was not persevered in as it appeared in the original Bill, but I mention it to show that although strong reasons may not exist at present the danger if not immediate may be pending.

My hon. friend from the city of Halifax spoke upon the subject of the Bill, and as he always does spoke with a great deal of acuteness and entered very fully into some points. My hon. friend, is as I may say, the analyst of the Opposition. His power of analysis is very great, and his observation is quick, and he has on various occasions rendered essential services not merely in Government measures but in measures introduced by private members in analyzing bills that were submitted here and discovering defects that existed. It is a very important function of the Opposition, no doubt, to criticise every measure, and it is a very important thing to have men capable of doing so. But when my hon. friend, if he will permit me to call him so, comes to deal with Government measures he reminds one very much of a naturalist who has a new creature—some new insect to examine. He places it in a strong light under a powerful microscope, and he discovers everything in connection with it and is able to, and does, examine it with the most minute care. That being the case, my hon. friend possessing the power and the ability to deal with matters in that way, I think it is saying a great deal for this Bill that he was able to urge so little against it. He had very little to say on the subject. He left the bill almost untouched except upon one point—I mean any material point—and on that point I venture to say he was mistaken. His reference was to the government of the United States. It is true as he says that the United States have adopted the franchise in several states instead of making a uniform franchise for the election of all federal officers, but he fails, I think, to perceive the difference between this Dominion and the United States. Canada does not stand in the same relation to the provinces as the federal government of the United States does to the several states. There the rights are delegated by the states to the Central Government: under our constitution the converse of the proposition is true—the Crown with us is supreme, and power not delegated remains with the Dominion. Therefore the argument he would draw from the United States, practice I think is not well-founded seeing the condition of things is different. The subject of this Bill has now been for a long time before the public. There has been great divergence of opinion as to what the franchise should be, and for the last eight weeks or more the measure has occupied the time of the Commons. There was "a sound of revelry by night," and my hon. friend from Ottawa would be disposed to say, not that "music arose with its voluptuous swell," but with its "patriotic swell." He believes the whole thing was a patriotic effort. Whatever was patriotic in it, I think, was shared by those who supported, as well as those who opposed, the measure. A struggle, in which physical endurance was the prominent feature, has been played out to the close. It was not, I thought, a very edifying spectacle, but I suppose it may have its uses as both parties have resorted to the expedient at different times. There were intervals, however, in which the voice of reason was heard, and much light thrown upon the subject. I am, I confess, unable to see that a perfectly just franchise, scientifically accurate, is attainable; the most that can be hoped for is an approximate estimate of social value on the basis of property, and possibly educated intelligence. So far as I am capable of judging I believe that the franchise provided for in the Bill before us, if not theoretically perfect, will be found suitable to the condition of things throughout the Dominion at large, and embrace substantially all to whom the right should be entrusted. But this branch of the Bill has been fully and

somewhat exhaustively discussed both in the House of Commons and by the public press of the country, and I certainly do not feel equal to cast any additional light on the point. I purpose confining the few remarks which I shall venture to make to one branch of the subject with which I have some acquaintance—the preparation of the voters' list—with this I have been familiar from its inception till the latter part of 1883. The revising barrister's clauses have been bitterly assailed by opponents of the measure, and warmly supported by the Government and its supporters, so also by the Opposition press and the papers that supported the Government. I have not seen the subject discussed by independent public writers, and I do not recollect a single instance of a lawyer, not a pronounced party man, writing for or against these clauses. Much said on both sides struck me as strongly colored by party prejudice, and not over-conspicuous, in all cases, for an earnest seeking after truth. I wish to point out some defects inherent in the present system of preparing the voters' lists in Ontario, where more attention has been given to legislation on the subject than in any other Province in the Dominion, and although the Hon. Mr. Mowat has labored for years to make it as complete and as perfect as possible, I think it is not what it might be, not what I believe it will become under the proposed change. I think the honorable the Attorney-General for Ontario is entitled to great credit for his able and persistent efforts in this direction, and though not agreeing with him on several public matters I entertain a very warm respect for him. Of his earnestness and ability as a public man there can be no doubt. I venture to say, however, that the system which prevails in Upper Canada, intended for Dominion purposes to be replaced by the provision of this Bill, is defective, and I say this after several years' experience and using my best efforts to secure the proper working of the voter's list law in Ontario. The best that was possible with the machinery has been accomplished, perhaps. Yet I cannot but think that if Mr. Mowat felt he could operate on lines where science was supreme, he would have probably placed on the statute book clauses very similar to those Revising Barristers' clauses so much objected to. It probably occurred to Mr. Mowat that the work of preparing the voters' list being of merely a ministerial character and not judicial, he could not constitutionally require it to be done by the local judges, they being under the constitution appointed by the general Government for the performance of duties of a judicial character, and there certainly being no undertaking or liability on their part to perform business of a non-judicial character. Or, if he concluded that the judges might possibly make no objection to do the work as commissioners under an act of the Legislature, he may have felt that it would be an unreasonable thing to impose such a large addition to their work without paying them for it by an addition to their salary. But this the province could not constitutionally do. These considerations, especially the latter, may have operated with him, for Mr. Mowat has always been very considerate towards the county judges, and did everything he could to benefit their condition within constitutional limits. These difficulties do not prevail, at all events to the same extent, in legislation by the Dominion; possibly there may be some question about the first, requiring judges to do the non-judicial work. But the first minister has guarded against difficulty in this connection by keeping the office of Revising Barrister distinct. As to the second, providing for payment of the extra work there would be no difficulty, and I fancy few of the judges would hesitate to undertake it if a proper allowance was made. The present system of preparing voters' lists is not a thing in itself, originally a graft upon the municipal assessment law, it so remains, that is, information collected and designed for one purpose is used for another and different one, and the numerous officers engaged in the work are not appointed by or directly amenable to the Province. In Ontario between 1400 and 1500 subordinate officers are so employed—assessors and municipal clerks. It is obvious that with a system requiring so many agents the want of consistency in administration is an evil inseparable from it—the differences introduced by the various degrees of knowledge, prejudice, intelligence, or care of the agents must be infinite, and a

very cursory acquaintance with the working will supply abundant proof of what I say—nor is much improvement to be looked for. I have been familiar with it from the commencement till some two years ago, and spared no pains to instruct and advise clerks and assessors in respect to their duties. By preparing yearly and circulating printed suggestions and instructions to these officers, pointing out errors which came under my notice from time to time, as well as by addresses, at the instance of the County Council, to officers personally. Mine was a large jurisdiction, some 95 or 100 officers, and the work was as well or better done than in other jurisdictions in the Province. But mistakes were of constant occurrence. The same mistakes often repeated year aftter year, and with all the pains taken. I am safe in saying there was no voters' list entirely correct and complete. Errors crept in in an unaccountable way. The defects of the system, in addition to the general objections I have referred to, were due to the constant changes in officials and their imperfect remuneration. And I may add, the selection, in some cases, of agents whose chief recommendation was that they were active politicians. Assessors and clerks are subjected to yearly appointments; they have no certainty of tenure, and are without the stimulus which the permanent officer has, to acquire an accurate knowledge of all the details of duty. And they are insufficiently paid; indeed the vicious method prevails in many municipalities of putting up the office for tender and giving it to the person undertaking to do it at the lowest rate. Anyone familiar with an assessors duty will know that considerable time and travel, especially in the townships, are required to secure the proper information, and great care and attention needed in placing every necessary detail upon the assessment roll, and for this work $20 is often the whole allowance to the assessor, the average remuneration probably not exceeding $75. And so it is with municipal clerks who are, except in a few cases, not paid more than half what their services are worth; and they, in addition to the general duties of their office, have the preparation of the voters' lists from the assessment roll, including the alphabetical arrangement of the whole, the causing it to be printed, the revision of the printed list, and the distribution thereof when printed. My views on the subject have not been recently formed, and I may venture to read some extracts from a published address to assessors which shows what in 1877 I thought on the subject.

"The Assessor holds one of the most responsible offices under our excellent Municipal system; his duties are extensive and important, requiring not merely great care and accuracy, in detail, but varied knowledge and sound judgment for their due discharge. His functions are not merely corporate—he is one of the many agencies employed by the Legislature of the country to perform certain duties of a general and public character.

"The importance of securing competent men to fill the position must be obvious to all. A complete and reliable Assessment is the only fair basis for taxation, and the work of the Assessor is also the material from which the Voters' Lists are formed, and serves various purposes in connection with our educational and legal systems. As to what more immediately concerns a Municipality—if the work of Assessment is not correctly and well done it may expose the municipality to law suits and costs; and imperfect Assessments *have* actually caused the loss of thousands of dollars, in loss of taxes, to more than one Municipality in the County, besides generating difficulties requiring years to overcome.

"With knowledge, therefore, of the importance of the duties and the serious consequences that result from careless or imperfect work by an Assessor, Municipal Councillors, custodians of the public interests, are bound to secure good and suitable men for the work, and the Council that fails to do this is not acting in the true interests of the constituency.

"How is it to be done? *First*—By holding out the inducement of fair and reasonable wages. The fact is, that Assessors, as a rule, are poorly paid in proportion to the services rendered, the amount and character of the work, and the responsibility of the position. In the language of the learned Chief Justice of Ontario, who has done so much to elucidate the Municipal Law,—'Poor pay, poor 'services, is the general rule; good servants 'are deserving of good pay, and good pay to 'good servants will in the long run be found 'to be true economy.'

"*Second*—It is most disastrous to a municipality to be constantly changing its officers, particularly the Assessor. It requires several years to gain the necessary acquaintance with the particular locality, and the value of property therein; and proper training in the work of this office, as in every department of business, is essential to a safe and beneficial discharge of the duties. Men do not bring into their harvest fields, or into their workshops, or their counting-houses, untrained men, if trained men can be had; and

as skilled labor is always more valuable to the employer, it should command higher wages. When a Municipality has secured a good officer, his services should be retained so long as he is able and willing to do his work properly. While I am glad to have an opportunity of a word in favor of better remuneration to Assessors, and saying it in the presence of the collective wisdom of the County, it is proper that I should add that however poorly requited, a careless or imperfect discharge of duty cannot be excused—the Assessor accepting office does so with his eyes open, the obligation to perform what the law requires of him is incurred when he accepts the office."

Now it may be said that there is an appeal to a court of revision from the assessment. But this court is composed of the municipal officers elected annually, an ever changing body who are in many cases without experience, and who have neither time nor in many cases inclination to devote the time necessary to understand their duties, and the work of revision is consequently as a rule done in a most perfunctory manner. The Legislature of Ontario evidently saw that assessments would be made upon no general principles, and that perfect reliance could not be placed upon them. Several municipalities would be pulling in different ways, each dealing with the subject from its own standpoint, with prejudices and all sorts of irregular influences in full play. To correct this evil so far as possible the legislature gave an appeal to the local judge. I recollect an appeal of this kind in which the judge found it necessary to a just equalization to increase the valuation from eleven millions and odd to fourteen millions and odd, adding almost one-third to the aggregate equalization by the county council. The duty of making out the voters' lists, arranging in alphabetical order, printing, issuing notices, etc. comes to the clerk at a busy season of the year, when he has numerous other duties crowded upon him, and the time given him to do the work is of the briefest. It cannot be a matter of surprise, therefore, if the work is imperfectly done, especially in the case of officers who have had little experience. It is true that an appeal is given to the County Judge, but only in electoral districts where party feeling runs high is much attention paid to the voters' lists till the day of election comes, and then errors of the most palpable kind are discovered, due to inattention or ignorance, or possibly in some cases to design. Now, the system proposed by this Bill will, I think, cure many of the evils inseparable from the present system and be a great improvement upon it. You will have under it an educated professional man, one above the reach of improper or irregular influences, to prepare the lists ; an officer alike independent of the Government and the public, secure in his position so long as he faithfully and efficiently performs the duties of his office, and who will every year be acquiring a further mastery of the subject : one who will be guided by principle and precedent in all he does. Instead of a perfect army of imperfectly trained, imperfectly educated agents without fixity in office, with a feeling ever present that as a breath has made them, so a breath can unmake, you will have, comparatively, a few men acting as revising barristers, so that uniform action on settled principles may well be expected. Besides this the body of revising barristers in each province will have an opportunity of conferring together and discussing questions, as was the practice under the Civil Bill system in Ireland, and which now prevails amongst the County Judges in Ontario. Moreover, the facilities for appeal and correction will be greatly facilitated. The political parties interested will be better and more effectually represented before the revising barrister than could probably be the case, with thirty or forty courts of appeal at no definitely fixed date for holding court, and with one instead of numerous agents to refer to for any information that might be necessary. Yes, I confidently assert that under the system proposed by this Bill, political parties may be conveniently and inexpensively represented, more so than they possibly could be under the existing law, and with greater assurance of a full and honest list. Of course, it is all-important that the best men should have inducements held out to accept the position of revising barristers. And with this end in view assurance has been given that where circumstances admit, the county judge will be offered the appointment. I take it that will be the general rule acted on, though there may be cases where, from the age of the judge, the

requirements of the judicial business proper in the jurisdiction, or the condition of the district, it would be inexpedient to take the county judge. In view of the judge being offered the position, it was important that the tenure should be during good behaviour, for I think it extremely probable that no judge would accept such an office, to hold office at the pleasure of the Crown. A good deal, however, has been said in the way of objection to such an appointment, and leaving it to the judges to name officers yearly finds favor in some quarters, this being the practice in England; but though the revising barrister may be appointed yearly the actual practice is to continue the incumbent in office during good behaviour; so that, in England, is practically the tenure. I think, myself, the mode proposed by the Bill is the best, and I cannot understand those who wish to act in harmony with the wishes of the people, as expressed by their representatives taking a different ground in Ontario. From the first institution of division courts, and until recently, the appointment of the officers, clerks and bailiffs was vested in the judges, and these officers held their appointments during pleasure of the judge. For some 40 years I myself performed that duty, and in that time appointed more than 100 officers, some of whom derived an income from fees greater than the judge who appointed him enjoyed from his salary. Well, all that, as I mentioned, is altered by an act of the Provincial Legislature, and the appointment of the six to eight hundred Division Court officers is now vested in the Government of the province. It was put perhaps not unreasonably in this way, that as the Government were responsible for the efficiency of the tribunals, it was only right that they should have control of the appointment of officers. If my memory serves me, the Opposition in Ontario professed to be as fearful as the Opposition in the Government of the Dominion now professes to be, that the power of appointment would be abused for political ends. So far as my observation extends I have seen no evidence of this in Ontario, and I feel quite sure that the Government of the Dominion will well and faithfully discharge their duties in the appointments to the more important position of revising barrister. And the contrast is altogether in favor of what is now proposed. For it is not proposed to reserve the power of removal at will to the Government of the Dominion, as was in Ontario reserved to the Government of the province in respect to Division Court officers. An incredible thing has been broadly asserted with all the bitterness of party expression, that the object of the Bill was to enable the Government to appoint pliant partizans for corrupt purposes, and wretched creatures would be found in the several provinces of the Dominion to act as willing tools for that nefarious purpose. I do not think I state too strongly the inference of what was said—said, I must think, in frenzy of political prejudice. But I cannot see how a reasonable man, not hurried into absurd extremes, could think so. If the Government aimed at any such thing the office would be made at pleasure, but the thing is too absurd to dwell upon. I have entire confideuce that the present Government will make the best appointments possible, and with the object of securing a just and honest administration of the law; and I will go further and say that I believe if the present Opposition held the reins of Government to-morrow their Government would be just as incapable of acting on such vicious principles. What hope would be for the future of the country if our public men were capable of such conduct; inducing a judge sworn to the faithful discharge of his duty to violate his oath and, oblivious to every principle of manhood and Christian duty, to favor a political friend? Men summoned to the Senate are reasonably taken from amongst these whose views are in the main in accord with the Government of the day, and because of some fitness for the position, will the most rabid politician contend for a moment, that any one appointed to this Hon. body in accepting the summons forfeits the right to think for himself in any measure that may come up, or surrender his conscience to the sway of party however much he may differ from his party on the particular case—of course not, the Senate could in such case have no attractions for an honest man. Yet the case of a judge is even still stronger, and yet the talk I have referred to presupposes members of the bar would be found willing to sacrifice all

that a man holds dear at the beck and nod of a Minister. I can scarcely bring my mind to believe that anyone seriously entertains the idea. I indignantly repel it as a gross slander upon the noble profession of which I have the honor to be a member. I do so emphatically in the case of the bar of Ontario, and I speak on the knowledge of nearly fifty years. At the close of the last century the Law Society of Upper Canada was established. In the language of the Act of Incorporation it was declared to be as well for the establishing of order amongst themselves as for the purpose of securing to the Province and to the profession a learned and hon. body to assist their fellow subjects as occasion may require and to support and maintain the constitution of the Province—and well and nobly have these objects been carried out as the records of the court, the records of Parliament and the political history of the country abundantly proves. But I cannot think that a doubt of the honor of the bar has permanent place with any. 'Tis true very bitter things are said in political discussions, and something of the prejudice that formed itself into a maxim 1,900 years ago, with a favored race, still survives amongst politicians, and, can anything good come out of Nazareth, is often the language of those politically opposed. I have not fallen in with anything from a calm, independent writer, against this measure, nor have members of the legal profession, who are not strong politicians, said aught against it. But I have read a good deal for and against it by the latter class. I have formed my own independent judgment—or rather, have adhered to the opinion I formed years ago—that it was desirable that the Parliament of Canada should regulate the right of suffrage for the Dominion, providing for the qualification of parliamentary electors the appropriate machinery by which it is to be evidenced in individual cases. I very willingly support this Bill believing it to be a necessary provision, and one that should have found a place on the statute book years ago. I am afraid I have encroached too long on the patience of the House, but I was desirous of placing deliberately on record my views on the subject. With regard to the power of the Dominion to deal with the subject, there can be of course no doubt. No one has contended that the Bill is unconstitutional, and with regard to the language in which the British North America Act is conceived, the hon. member from Amherst brought that out very clearly. The plain intimation to the Parliament of the Dominion, was to legislate on the subject, and I am sorry that it was not done years ago, and before the bitter feeling which has arisen of late years had entered the minds of the people. The expense, no doubt stood in the way. It will be attended with considerabe cost, but people must pay for their liberties and work would not be efficiently performed except the officers who performit are paid fairly and liberrally for what they do. I have no doubt the judges of the country will accept the work and be satisfied with reasonable remuneration, and I have no doubt whatever that the work will be better done than it is done to-day, and the only difficulty will be the preparation of the first lists; after that everything will work smoothly, and very little will have to be done by the judges from year to year, so that I feel in this measure very great and necessary improvements will be made. I again thank hon. gentlemen for having listened to what must have wearied their patience.

Hon. Mr. PAQUET (in French)—I shall vote with great pleasure for the motion of my hon. friend from Ottawa, and as I speak in a language which is not understood by the majority in this House, I shall be as brief as possible. The position which we, from the Province of Quebec, occupy in this House on a subject of this kind is a difficult one. We have also to deal with a measure which concerns the other Chamber only. The members of this House are not required to present themselves before the electorate, but on the other hand we occupy the position of moderators between the Crown and the people. I hope that among the hon. members of this House none will be found in favor of universal suffrage on the one side, or, on the other, of granting special privileges to an aristocratic minority. I regret that some members in this House, as well as in the other Chamber, fail to find any justification for our opposition to this Bill, and have gone so far as to accuse

us of disloyalty or want of patriotism. I say, speaking at least for the members representing the province from which I come, that such an assertion is a calumny. While I admit that those who oppose us are entitled to consideration, I hope that they will respect equally the position which we are obliged to assume, and that they will refrain from impugning our motives. We are told by those who support the Bill that we have no good reason for our opposition to the measure—at least, in the debate yesterday one hon. gentleman stated that he had heard up to that time not one single reason to justify opposition to the measure. Will those hon. gentlemen repeat that statement? If there is no ground for our opposition to the Bill, why is it that several hon. members, who have been life-long and consistent Conservatives, find themselves forced to range themselves with the Liberal party on this important question? It must, indeed, be an obnoxious measure which leads to such a result. I therefore feel bound to tell these hon. gentlemen that we, on our side, have yet to learn of any necessity for establishing a uniform franchise for the Dominion, the tendency of which would be to lead to a legislative union. The Government are trying to bring about legislative union, while we, on the other hand, desire to maintain the privileges which we enjoy under the constitution. Under the Confederation Act, the Government possess the right of legislating in this direction of a uniform franchise, but for eighteen years they have hesitated to introduce the system. They tell us that they wish to imitate the English franchise, that this measure is based on the English system. They seem to forget that there is no analogy between the circumstances of the two countries. In England there is no federal pact as we have here. They possess a legislative union; ours is a federal union. The two systems are different. The hon. member from DeSalaberry argued with great force yesterday that we have a great many tribunals already, and that this change will tend to increase the number, to create confusion and give rise to public discontent. We are told that the main reason for introducing this measure is because of the hostile legislation of some of the local legislatures. The Bill was conceived in a spirit of retaliation and not with a view to doing justice. I hope, however, that in this honorable House the minority will not have to look in vain for justice. One source of difficulty which is likely to arise under this Bill is the possibility of partiality on the part of the revising barrister. Another great objection to this Bill is the cost which it will entail, not only on the country, but on those who may find it necessary to appeal from the decision of the revising barrister. The hon. gentleman from Niagara says that the expense will be trifling, but he must bear in mind, that under any circumstances the appellant, whether he succeeds or not, will have to pay the costs of solicitors, witnessess, bailiffs, clerks &c. The only man who will have no such expense to bear will be the revising barrister; he will be free from any such cost whether the appeal is successful or not. Is that just? Is it desirable that this heavy expenditure should be incurred when, under the present system, the municipalities have always done the work of preparing the lists gratuitously? Has any one ever heard of the electors in any part of the country petitioning for a measure like this? No, it is introduced simply for the purpose of retaliation. It will involve an expense to the country of from $250,000 to $300,000 a year. That is a very considerable sum, and it would be much better expended if applied to the extension of our railways, the great civilizing agents of the age, the re-patriation of our fellow countrymen who have gone to other lands, or at least towards the establishing of a permanent force in the North-West in order to prevent a repetition of such disasters as have occurred there, and are still fresh in the public mind, and for other purposes, such as fostering agriculture etc. We are told that uniformity in the electoral franchise is necessary; yet an exception is made in favor of two of the provinces. No exception, however, is made in favor of the Province of Quebec, against which this Bill is evidently directed. It would be better to say at once that, after eighteen years of hesitation, they are now bent upon despoiling it little by little of its privileges. The Premier has always been in favor of a legislative union, and he seems determined now to accomplish his work. The Province of Quebec is, as you

all know, differently situated from any of the other provinces ; it occupies an exceptional position and enjoys special privileges, which privileges I consider are endangered by this Bill. Two members of this House, from the Province of Quebec, gentlemen who are known to be strong Conservatives, have found it necessary to rise and oppose this measure. The hon. member for DeLanaudiere (Mr. Bellerose) and the hon. member for DeSalaberry (Mr. Trudel,) and several others have taken alarm, and have separated themselves from their life-long political friends. They have exclaimed "Stop, here is a dangerous measure for our province!" In the other House the same spectacle was presented, and the reply which was made there, and which has been echoed with greater emphasis here by the hon. member from Niagara, is "This is obstruction." We are told that all the debating and criticism which took place on the measure in the other House was nothing but obstruction. But are those who raise that cry really sincere? If the delay was due only to a policy of obstruction, why is it, that after the Bill had been referred to a Committee of the Whole in the House of Commons, the Government did not proceed resolutely with its measure? What were the Government doing during nearly eight days after the Bill was reported from Committee? Nothing. They should have pressed the legislative work, but they did nothing or next to nothing. Even if the Bill had not been of a most objectionable character, it would have been a strange spectacle indeed to see the House in session for weeks with little or no business before it. And why was this? Because, as rumor says, (and I think well-founded rumor) it was necessary to continue the Session to the present day in order that the two Houses might be in attendance here to ratify the transactions which Sir Leonard Tilley has made in the English money market, on his return. That is why the Session has been prolonged, but it suited the Government better to publicly accuse the Opposition of prolonging the session by pursuing an obstructive policy, and to present them in an odious light to the public for a delay which, I contend, was inevitable, owing to the policy of the Government. Many members of both Houses knew that, and, of course, the Minister of Justice above all others, and knowing it, I think he should have used his influence to prevent an unfounded charge being made against the Opposition. Do they call that fair play? I leave it to the hon. member from Niagara to reply. He is generally near the Minister and well instructed. The fact of having succeeded in eliminating from the Bill a considerable number of objectionable features justified the Opposition in their energetic action, unless, as we are informed by the hon. member from Niagara, those objectionable clauses were inserted in the Bill for the sole purpose of giving the Government the extreme pleasure of striking them out afterwards. I leave the House to say what they think of such an argument.

HON. MR. POIRIER (in French)—Although the House is anxious to terminate the debate, I wish, before a vote is taken, to offer a few words in explanation of my position on this measure. In replying to the arguments of the hon. member from LaValliere (Mr. Paquet), I will at the same time answer those of the hon. member from DeSalaberry (Mr. Trudel). They have contended that the effect of this Bill will be to centralize power at Ottawa. If I understand the Bill properly it deprives no elector of the franchise ; everyone who has a vote to-day will continue to have a vote under this Bill, but the franchise will be extended, so far as the election of members to the Dominion Parliament is concerned. In the several provinces the local legislatures will continue to fix the franchise for local elections ; this Bill does not in any way interfere with the management of local affairs, but instead of municipal officers preparing the lists, as is the case now, officers will be appointed by the authorities here for that purpose. The voters here will be the same, the principle of election will be the same ; the only difference that this Bill makes, that I can see, is that instead of having the lists prepared by municipal organizations, they will be prepared by our own officers. While we leave to the provinces all the liberty they enjoy to-day, and while we do not interfere in the slightest degree with their rights, I cannot see any reasonable ground of objection to the measure, and I shall vote for it because I see no evidence in it of any tendency to centralization.

Parliament has never conceded the right of the local authorities to say who shall be eligible for election to the Dominion Parliament, and there can be no doubt that it is equally their right to say how members shall be elected to the House of Commons. The system which has been pursued in this respect hitherto, has been exceptional. I do not know of one solitary instance in which a legislative body, possessing a right such as this, has allowed other bodies to exercise it for them for a number of years. It is an anomaly which has beeen recognized and commented upon by leading men on both sides of politics in this country. There can be no doubt that the privilege exists under the constitution, and the House of Commons simply exercises the privilege now which it should have enjoyed and exercised all along, under the Confederation Act. That it has not been done sooner is due to the fact that the necessity did not arise until late years. The Province of Nova Scotia, with a view to injuring the Government of the day here, disfranchised the employés on the Intercolonial Railway in their Province. Mr. Mowat gerrymandered the Province of Ontario and modified the electoral laws repeatedly and in such a way as to create confusion. Under the laws of the Dominion the qualification for members is uniform through the Dominion, and the same reason exists why the franchise should be uniform. If this law had for its object the perpetration of injustice upon any province—if for example it refused to the people of the Province of Quebec, or New Brunswick, the rights which are accorded to every other province, it should meet with my opposition. Though I represent New Brunswick in this House, my sympathies extend also to the Province of Quebec, and I should vote with the hon. gentlemen who represent that Province here if I could see that the measure in any sense or degree injuriously affected the Province of Quebec. But the franchise proposed by this Bill disturbs least of all the system which prevails in that Province and can have no injurious effect upon its people. There is less change in the Province of Quebec than in any other part of the Dominion and there is less reason there to feel any alarm because of this measure. To my mind this Bill, instead of injuring, will prove a decided benefit to the Province of Quebec. We have the Bill condemned on the one side because it is too liberal, while on the other it is claimed that it is not liberal enough. Well, I think we will all concede that the House of Commons has a right to make laws of this kind to suit itself, and we should hesitate before interfering in the slightest degree with a measure which is so exclusively one pertaining to themselves. I hold that it would be indelicate for us to interfere with the decision which has been arrived at in the other chamber, and to put our veto upon it, especially when it is strictly in accord with the right conferred upon them by the constitution. Even Mr. Blake and Mr. Laurier admitted in their speeches that the Bill was strictly constitutional. It occupied the time of the other House for two months, and every clause and line of the Bill was fully discussed. Are we to conclude, under these circumstances, that the representatives of the people in the other Chamber do not know what they require for themselves? For my part, there is not a clause of the Bill with which I would care to interfere, and therefore I shall vote for the Bill as it stands and oppose any and every amendment that may be offered. I have said before, that the Bill is not unfavourable to the Province of Quebec; it will not only retain its present electors, but it will increase their number, and I contend that Quebec will derive a special advantage beyond any which the Bill confers on the other provinces. As we all know, in that province there are very large families. Under the existing law only the father votes, while his sons living with him do not exercise the franchise. Under this Bill, not only the father but his sons will exercise the franchise, and, owing to the fact that the families are so large, there will be a very great increase in the number of voters. The same applies to the French-Acadians of the Lower Provinces. Under the circumstances, I think it is the Province of Quebec that is most favored by this Bill, and if any province should feel itself injured by the change it is Ontario. I find no fault with those who look for manhood suffrage. I would even advocate it for rural districts ,and I think of all other provinces, the Province of Quebec should have least to fear from such an extension

of the franchise. They are a wise and conservative population, amongst whom there is no taint of socialism or nihilism, and they would therefore be a safe population to exercise such a privilege. I do not believe in so frequently bringing up the questions of socialism or radicalism in a land like ours. The tendency of such a course would be, were our population not so conservative in their social principles to give rise to the very evils which we deprecate. The hon. gentleman from De Lanaudiere, says that this Bill takes the control of the family from the father. I say it strengthens the influence of the family instead of weakening it, because, for instance, a family consisting of a father and four grown-up sons will have five votes under this Bill, whereas at present they have only one. Children generally, with rare exceptions, obey their fathers, and by this law you offer inducements to the boys to stay at home with their parents. The Bill does not give the sons a share in the father's property except for political purposes, and therefore cannot place them in a more independent position as members of the family. I say the Bill is a good one for the Province of Quebec, and even a liberal one. It extends the franchise, at the same time taking precaution to extend it mainly amongst the agricultural population, who deserve to enjoy the right of voting for candidates for the Dominion Parliament. An agricultural population is one which can safely be entrusted with the ballot; it is not such a people that abuses the privilege. These are my principal reasons for supporting the measure—because it relates especially and exclusively to the House of Commons, and because it does not abridge any existing right, but extends the franchise to classes who ought to have a right to vote. The only consideration which could properly justify the Senate in interfering with this Bill would be if the provinces were in any way wronged by the majority in the House of Commons, or if in our opinion the measure were in any way unconstitutional. Neither of these objections being alleged, and the Bill being one peculiarly affecting the House of Commons and the intimate relations of members with their constituents, there is no occasion for us to interfere. Therefore, I repeat, I shall vote for the Bill as it stands.

The Senate divided on the amendment, which was rejected on the following vote :—

CONTENTS :

Hon. Messrs.

Armand,	McMaster,
Baillargeon,	Pâquet,
Bellerose,	Power,
Boucherville de,	Reesor,
Chaffers,	Scott,
Guévremont,	Stevens,
Haythorne,	Trudel,
Leonard,	Wark.—17.
McClelan,	

NON-CONTENTS :

Hon. Messrs.

Allan,	Macdonald,
Bolduc,	MacInnes,
Campbell, (Sir Alex.),	Miller (Speaker),
Carvell,	Montgomery,
Chapais,	Nelson,
Clemow,	Northwood,
DeBlois,	O'Donohoe,
Dever,	Ogilvie,
Dickey,	Plumb,
Girard,	Poirier,
Gowan,	Read,
Howlan,	Robitaille,
Kaulbach,	Ross,
McDonald,	Smith,
McKay,	Sutherland,
McKindsey,	Vidal.—33.
McMillan,	

The Bill was then read the second time.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT 1883, AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the Whole on Bill (134), "An Act respecting the Liquor License Act 1883."

In the Committee,

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This is a Bill consisting of one clause to suspend, while the discussion is going on in the courts with reference to the legality of the clauses referred to in the Bill, the operation of certain clauses of the Act which have, in the meantime at all events, been pronounced *ultra vires* by the court

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE, from the Committee, reported the Bill

without amendment, and it was then read he third time and passed.

CONSOLIDATED MILITIA ACT, 1883, AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (152) "An Act to amend the Consolidated Militia Act of 1883." He said—This is a Bill to enable Her Majesty to raise, in addition to the present service, an active militia force which may be any number of men not exceeding 1,000, to be divided into such corps as Her Majesty may from time to time direct. So far as I have been able to understand from the Minister of Militia, it is not intended to increase the force beyond the establishment of additional military schools, one particularly in Winnipeg to be composed of two branches of the service, the cavalry branch, and the infantry branch. It is also contemplated to establish another school, possibly in the Province of Quebec, but at all events it is with reference to these schools that this force is intended to be provided. The preservation of the peace in the North-West it is proposed to entrust to the Mounted Police and to the force which may be established under this Act in connection with the military school in Winnipeg. The Bill consists of only one clause, and I move that it be read the second time at length at the table.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Perhaps my hon. friend would explain—I have not the statute at hand—the number of men authorised to be raised.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Seven hundred and fifty.

HON. MR. SCOTT—This Bill provides for an increase of 250?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Is it proposed to increase the force to 1,000?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I understand that it is to be limited to 1,000 men altogether.

HON. MR. POWER—I think the course suggested by the hon. member from Ottawa when we were dealing with a bill to provide for an increase of the Mounted Police force was wise. I do not see why it is necessary to mantain so many military schools but I think a portion of the force—one at all events of the two batteries kept down here—might be kept in the North-West, and I do not see the wisdom of the provision of this Bill which is that there shall be two more companies of infantry added. If it is necessary to have one infantry company for the purpose of establishing the military school, one at least of the two additional companies ought to be a cavalry company. If the difficulties in the North-West have taught us anything it is that infantry are of comparatively little value in that country. What is the most needed now is a strong and effective cavalry force, and I fail to see what necessity there is for two more companies of infantry or the wisdom of adding to our infantry force and leaving the cavalry force as it stands.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—If there is one thing I should speak upon it is certainly this of the North-West Mounted Police.

HON. MR. POWER—This is not the Bill.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I know it is not the Bill but it is partially connected with it, and I say this, the more powers we can give to the officers of the North-West Mounted Police force the better you will be serving your country. They have been found specially qualified for that North-West service. There is no man appointed there, that I know of, who has not served in, and knows all about the country to which his duty calls him. That being the case, they are the men that we should promote as officers if we can possibly do so. It may not be always possible to appoint officers from the force that is out there; but I know individually that in a great many cases it is possible, and that it would be advantageous to appoint the best men who have served for years and years in that force, and know the country and the difficulties of the position from beginning to end. I know all about them myself; I know the men

connected with the force, and notwithstanding what may have been said against them, they are our best men for the North-West. They are the men that we have to depend upon; and I say that 500 of those North-West Mounted Police are worth more to us to-day for immediate service than 5,000 raw volunteers. It may seem very hard for me to say so, and some of our volunteers may feel annoyed at me for what I have said. It is not a flattering statement to make, but it is true.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

The Senate adjourned at 6 o'clock.

THE SENATE.

, Monday, July 13th, 1885.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

VETERANS OF THE WAR OF 1812.

PETITIONS OFFERED.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE presented the petition of Joseph Couseneau, a veteran of the war of 1812–15, and Henrietta Guimond, widow of Jean Baptiste Coutu, a veteran of the war of 1812–15, praying to be allowed pensions. He said: I have some doubt as to whether these petitions can be received. However, I present them and leave it to the Speaker to say whether they can be received.

THE SPEAKER—They are not in order.

THE TRIALS AT REGINA.

INQUIRY.

HON. MR. TRUDEL inquired:—

Whether the Government has taken into consideration the question whether it would not be better in the interests of justice to modify the law in such a manner as to afford to persons implicated in the rebellion in the North-West a trial before a jury of twelve of their fellow-subjects, such as the Common Law of the British Empire affords to every subject of Her Majesty?

He said: When the law which is at present in force in the North-West was adopted, the reason as I understand why the usual number of jurors was not provided for the trial of cases there, was that the population in that part of the country was very sparse. It is very well known that there will be shortly several trials there—if I understand rightly, not less than forty persons charged with being implicated in the late rebellion are to be tried. It seems to me that it might be possible to amend the law in such a way as to give those citizens the advantage of being tried by twelve of their own countrymen. It is for this reason I put the question. It is true that it is now very late in the session, but such an amendment as I suggest would require very little time, it could be passed in a very few hours.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—In reply to my hon. friend's question, I beg to say that the Government has not had under consideration the propriety of changing the law upon the point in question.

THE REBELLION IN THE NORTH-WEST.

INQUIRY.

HON. MR. TRUDEL inquired:—

Whether the Government has taken into consideration the question of protecting against famine by immediate aid those who on account of the rebellion have been deprived of all means of subsistence, and are exposed to perish from hunger and want?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The Government have had that matter under consideration and treated it with the greatest possible care. At this moment a good many of those who are suffering in the way pointed out by the question are receiving food from Government agents, and instructions have gone to the Lieut.-Governor to provide, as far as possible, that no suffering shall pass unconsidered, so far as we can consider it and relieve it. Also special care is being used, and persons have been appointed, for the purpose of making further inquiry so that we may

perhaps be able shortly to judge of what additional assistance should be given. Of course the Government is obliged to go very carefully; we do not want to encourage idleness, and we want as far as possible to so treat all cases of suffering as to prevent those who are relieved depending entirely on the food supplied by the Government; we want as far as possible to encourage them to work for a living. In the meantime, instructions have been given to the Lieut.-Governor, having for their object the relieving of any suffering as far as possible, with the means at our command.

THE SMITH DIVORCE CASE,

MOTION.

HON. MR. READ moved

That the fee paid on the Bill intituled "An Act for the relief of Charles Smith" be refunded to him less the expenses of printing and translation.

He said:—In this case the petitioner was not successful and he wishes to be refunded the deposit which he made, less the expenses of printing and translation. There are several authorities for making auch a refund.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think my hon. friend should add the expenses of the stenographer.

HON. MR. READ—This is just one of those motions for which we have precedents. There are instances on record where the stenographer was not named, although one was employed; for example, the case of Matthew Gardner, who dropped his bill after a great deal of evidence had been taken. Although a stenographer was employed no deduction was made on that account in refunding the money. I see here that the motion was made by Mr. Dickey, seconded by Mr. Ferrier, that the fee be refunded him, less the expense of printing and translation.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That has been the practice, I believe, but it is a practice that grew up before we employed stenographers.

HON. MR. READ—It is the practice that has been followed since we have employed stenographers. The case to which I refer occurred only two years ago. Mr. Gardner went on with his bill until such time, apparently, as he saw that it was likely to be lost, and then he dropped it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—In that case I suppose attention was not called to it.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It evidently was an inadvertence. The object of this money is to indemnify the House for all disbursements in connection with the case. If we have been lax and negligent in the past, it is for us to be careful now, and, in this case particularly, there is good reason why we should include the stenographer's fee. I think the merits of this case justify us in making a commencement in this direction. A deduction should be made for every charge that the Senate has been subject to in the way of expenses.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I hope my hon. friend will alter his motion to include the stenographer's fee. Why should the public suffer because this man chooses to come here and apply for a Bill to which, as it turns out, he is not entitled? I cannot see any sense in it.

HON. MR. READ—I cannot see why he should be made an example of, and a different course pursued towards him from that which has been followed in other cases. I have given you an instance in point where the only deductions made were for printing and translation.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Attention was not drawn probably, in that case to the matter; there is no difference between the expenses of the stenographer and the expenses of printing.

HON. MR. READ—There is no difference, I admit, but the precedents do not show that such a reduction has ever been made heretofore.

HON. MR. PLUMB—If I remember the case, it was one in which the petitioner had no ground whatever for making the

application. He must have known his position and he must accept the consequences of that position; I see no reason why the public should be put to expense for a suit upon a petition which proved to be as groundless as that one was.

Hon. Mr. READ—Then I will amend it to add the word "stenographer."

The motion, as amended, was agreed to.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Bill (153), "An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway and to provide for the completion and successful operation thereof." (Mr. Smith.)

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into committee of the whole on Bill (103) "An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise."

In the committee.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not know whether hon. members will desire to go through this Bill, clause by clause, the provisions relating to the other branch of Parliament. What seems to be the more convenient way is if hon. gentlemen would draw attention to any particular clause we might discuss that clause and it might not be necessary to go through the Bill in detail. What does the hon. member from Ottawa think of that?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—With reference to making amendments to the Bill in committee I did not propose, myself, to offer any at this stage, much preferring any amendment which I have to submit should be at the third reading of the Bill in order that the yeas and nays may be taken. However, other hon. gentlemen may entertain a different view; but that is my suggestion—to offer no amendments in committee. Probably the shorter and simpler way would be to call out the leading words of each clause and then if any hon. gentlemen wish to say anything with reference to it an opportunity will be afforded to do so.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I should suggest, as the Minister has a copy of the Bill with marginal notes, it would be sufficient to read the marginal notes to each clause.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CMPBELL—I will do that. The first section with several subsections is with reference to the interpretation of terms.

Hon. Mr. DeBOUCHERVILLE—This interpretation is very important. On the second page, line 10, there is an interpretation with reference to the Chinese, which I think is very important. For my part I should like to protest against that definition.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is not proposed to give votes to the Chinese at present.

Hon. Mr. DeBOUCHERVILLE—I should like to have a vote upon that.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend could move the amendment at the third reading.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—I agree with my hon. friend opposite, but I think it would be better that we should have an explanation why the Chinese are to be deprived of votes. I cannot myself see the propriety of excluding the Mongolians, who have shown themselves to be patient, industrious and law-abiding, from privileges which are given to every other member of the human family in this country.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—We are not troubled here with the Chinese, but perhaps if they were as numerous here in proportion to the population as they are in British Columbia we might share the objection which is entertained to them there.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD—The objection to the Chinese is that they are not British subjects. No one desires to give them a vote, and I think this a good provision. I remember at one time that the Chinese were allowed to vote in British Columbia, and the way it worked was this: I used to go round in the mornings and leave my card with the voters, and my

opponent would come afterwards and tear it up and leave his own. Then I would go the next morning and tear his up. Then, on polling day the question was which would succeed in carrying the Chinese to the poll? I have seen my opponent take them in waggon loads, like sheep.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Does my hon. friend think that the Indian vote would be any better than that?

HON. MR. MACDONALD—Yes, I do. The Indians are residents of the soil, and a much better class of citizens.

HON. MR. POWER—I think the House is entitled to some explanation from the Government as to why they have decided to give a vote to the Indian and exclude the Chinese.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think I gave that the other day; I certainly gave an explanation the other day, why the Indians are allowed to vote.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. member from British Columbia gave a reason, which is not a reason, for excluding the Chinese; he says they are not British subjects. If they are not British subjects, then they cannot vote in any case; if they are British subjects, I do not see, when we allow the Indians and Negroes to vote, why we should deprive Chinamen of the franchise.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We certainly gave a reason the other day why the Indian should be allowed to vote, and I think it was most eloquently given by my hon. friend from Niagara, a reason which ought to be perfectly satisfactory, and I judge by the vote given that the House was satisfied. We did not give any reason for excluding the Chinese, or Mongolian race, as that question did not come up. It is not one that affects us in this part of the Dominion, but it does affect the people of British Columbia, and why should we give those people a vote when the general feeling in British Columbia is so strongly against it? Why should they participate in the rights and privileges of British subjects when they in no way fulfil the duties of British subjects, and when they are still an alien race, without any feeling of interest or any permanent abode in the Dominion? There is no reason that they should, and, as we would be obliged to go contrary to the feelings of the whole province, to give the Chinese a vote, it seems to me that it would be a very inexpedient thing to do, and that is the reason which influenced the Government in excluding those persons from the franchise.

HON. MR. NELSON—The people of British Columbia, in asking for legislation against the Chinese, as they have this session—as against their enjoying such privileges as this Bill intends to prevent them from enjoying—have not stood alone. In California, the United States generally, and every part of the world where we have had European nations, and more particularly Anglo-Saxons, there has been a strong feeling of antipathy to the Chinese coming amongst them, and the same antipathy exists to-day in British Columbia. It has been found in all parts of the world where the Chinese have been aggressive, as they are aggressive in our province, that legislation of this kind is necessary. In comparing the Chinese with the Indians, we should bear in mind that the Indians were the owners of the soil, and that we should not overlook their rights. The Chinese are aliens.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Why exclude the Indians in British Columbia from the franchise?

HON. MR. NELSON—We are excluding the Indians in British Columbia from the franchise, and I will give the hon. gentleman a good reason for excluding them. One of the objections raised to exclude Indians from voting by a great many gentlemen in the other House holding the same views as the hon. gentleman opposite, has been that the Indians are not a sufficiently civilized people. In the Province of Ontario, and in these other older Provinces, where the Indians occupy a better position, and where they have a certain amount of wealth and a certain annual income, it shows that they are capable of exercising the franchise.

HON. MR. POWER—The same as a Chinaman is.

HON. MR. NELSON—In British Columbia the lowest savage is able to make the amount of money that the franchise requires; he can earn from $200 to $400 a year.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—It seems to me that this is a question on which this House ought to express its opinion freely, because it is not only an important question to-day, but it is likely to become more so in the future. We are not bound by what the feeling of British Columbia is on that point, because political questions enter so largely into the matter there. The progress of that Province, and the progress of the North-West generally, may be greatly retarded if the means of obtaining cheap labor is kept out of the country. I would myself willingly adopt any measure that might be thought necessary to keep a disreputable Chinese out of the Province; but if I am rightly informed one of the great complaints against Chinese laborers is, that a very low class of Chinese are kidnapped and put on board ships and brought out to this country by persons who have contracts to fill to supply labor in British Columbia. If the Bill that has been brought down this session becomes law, it seems to me that this objection to undesirable Chinese will be overcome, because they will not be brought into the country; but it appears to me that refusing the franchise to the respectable Chinaman who fulfils all the duties of a good citizen; who supports his family respectably, educates his children, and pays his taxes, is committing an act which tends rather to the injury of British Columbia than its advancement. If you wish to get respectable Chinese labor there, you ought to hold out every inducement to them to come; but if you tell the Chinaman that no matter how reputable he may be in British Columbia he will have no vote at all, it will deter them from coming to the country.

HON. MR. NELSON—That is what we want.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE — Until those arguments are refuted by something stronger than I have heard, I shall continue to believe in them; and I shall continue to believe that this absolute refusal to allow Chinese laborers to vote is an error.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The Chinese question has been discussed at considerable length in the other House and elsewhere for some time past. It has been discussed in the United States, and it has been decided in that country that the Chinese should not be admitted to the franchise, even on the broad basis that exists there of universal suffrage. My hon. friend says that we get a low class of the Chinese in this country. I do not know any way in which we can get a different class than those who are brought out under contract, which they make themselves with the companies who furnish Chinese laborers. Each Chinaman has an agreement by which he is to remain in the employ of the company a certain time. He is to be guaranteed a certain payment by his employers, and also his passage back to China—to Shanghai, or to any place he wishes—and in case of his death his body is sent back to China—he even grudges us his bones for manure. In his habits he is not for a moment to be compared with the Negro or the Indian who live amongst us; he comes as a member of an alien race, with superstitions, with ideas, and with habits which are entirely distinct from our own; with sympathies which are distinct, and he cannot mingle, and will not mingle with other races.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—Supposing he was a Christian Chinaman?

HON. MR. PLUMB—It is so wild a supposition that I will not make it. The Jesuit missionaries have been laboring in China for over 100 years, and they have made no appreciable impression on them.

HON. MR. POWER—Yes, they have made some progress in some parts of China.

HON. MR. PLUMB—If my hon. friend will take up the history of China a work written by Hook, Crabbe and others who have devoted themselves to the work of

Chinese instruction, he will find that it is not the case. I know from the statements of merchants from two different cities in China that Christianity has made no appreciable progress amongst the Chinese, and even the class that come under the influence of the missionaries is not the class that come out to this country; they are employed to a large extent by the merchants in China. I do not agree at all with my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island that a better class of Chinamen would be encouraged to come here if they were told that by settling in Canada they would be entitled to the franchise.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It would not tempt them.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It will not tempt them, and those who are here have not asked to be enfranchised; they have not thought of being voters; such a thing has not entered into their heads.

HON. MR. POWER—Have the Indians asked to be made voters?

HON. MR. PLUMB—We must remember that the influx of those people is upon the Pacific coast, and if the people of the Pacific Province have made up their minds that they do not want the Chinese to vote, after studying their habits, and having been in contact with them from day to day, I think it would be very impolitic for us to force the Chinese upon the people of British Columbia.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B. C.)—I would like to ask the Minister of Justice what is meant by the term "Mongolian or Chinese race?" Does it apply merely to a Chinaman fresh from China, or does it apply to a half-breed, quarter breed, or octoroon?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There are no half breed Chinamen that I know of.

HON. MR. MCINNES—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, there are half breed Chinamen.

HON. MR. PLUMB—If there are half breed Chinamen in British Columbia they are not old enough to have a vote.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This would certainly exclude from the franchise any person of Chinese blood.

HON MR. MCINNES—Then, if so, I think it is a hardship. It is an undoubted fact that some Chinamen marry white women. They have families, and they bring up their children in a very respectable, intelligent way; and when such children attain the years of manhood, and have the necessary qualification, I think it would be a great hardship to refuse them the franchise. I am not objecting to the clause, but I am merely calling the attention of the Government to this fact and to suggest that it would be better to define how far the word "Mongolian" should go.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There may be some definition given to it hereafter, but it will hardly do to send this Bill back to the Commons for the purpose of defining the word "Mongolian."

HON. MR. NELSON—I have never known a Chinaman to marry a white woman in British Columbia.

HON. MR. MCINNES—My attention was called to this matter by the hon. member from Peterborough who stated to me some time ago, when this Bill was introduced into the House of Commons, that a most respectable citizen in Peterborough, was a Chinaman; that he was married there and was well connected, and that his children were educated in the best schools in the Province. He instanced this as a case of great hardship.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It would be a pity to send this Bill back to the Commons for amendment for the sake of one instance of this kind.

HON. MR. MCINNES—It is one instance now; but I can assure the hon. gentleman from Niagara that immediately after the completion of the Pacific railway there will be a large influx of Chinese into the eastern provinces, and this Bill may perhaps inflict hardships on persons who ought not to be treated in this way.

HON. MR. POWER—We have not yet heard any good reasons for excluding the Chinese. It is true that, as a general thing, the Chinese do not become naturalized; but take the exceptional Chinamen who do become subjects of Her Majesty, and have the qualification under the election law; there is no reason why they should not vote. It is said that British Columbia does not wish the Chinaman to vote. It is pretty hard to say what British Columbia does desire in that respect, as there seems to be a difference of opinion on it amongst the representatives of that province. If British Columbia does not wish a certain class to vote there, it is one reason for thinking that we should not undertake to deal with the franchise at all—that we should leave it with the provinces. I venture to say that if the opinion of the Province of Ontario was taken on the Indian vote there would be just as strong a condemnation of the proposition to enfranchise the Indians as there would be in the Province of British Columbia against the Chinese.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear, hear. I want to emphasize the hon. gentleman's statements.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not think the Parliament of Canada should make any distinction of race at all; that the Chinese, Negroes, Indians and Whites should be on the same footing; that no exceptions should be made in favor of one or against another race. This Bill provides that an Indian shall vote, although he does not own property and cannot make a bargain; and at the same time it provides that the Chinaman shall not vote although he does own property and is in a position to make contracts. I do not propose to take up the time of the Committeee, but I feel that it is my duty to enter a protest against the injustice and inequality of the proposition. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice what reason there is, considering that this Bill is proposed chiefly for the purpose of creating uniformity, that the cities of Hull and St. Hyacinthe in the province of Quebec are made towns for the purposes of this Bill?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is because those two places having a large population, if a city qualification were required there it would make the electing body much smaller than if we make them towns for the purpose of this Act.

HON. MR. SCOTT—My hon. friend will recollect that there are several towns in Ontario which are now cities, where the population is about the same as that of Hull. Take Belleville, St. Catherines and Stratford, for instance, which have recently been made cities, and have about the same population as Hull: they should be treated in the same way. I think also that my hon. friend ought to consider whether it is not possible to modify the Chinese clause. It is very repugnant to myself; but my principal reason is that we are discriminating against Chinamen in the face of the world. When we look at the policy of the Empire, it seems to me to be extremely incongruous on our part to take this action. We all know that for the last century every effort has been made to get entrance into China. We tried to induce them to believe that they ought to trade with the outside world, and that they ought to become more cosmopolitan, and after bombarding their beautiful capital, Pekin, they did see the propriety of fraternizing with civilized nations. They no sooner begin to do so than they find we set up a Chinese wall on our side; we say it is all right that our people should trade in China and acquire property and civil rights there, but Chinese should not be allowed similar privileges in our country. To my view it is entirely contrary to the principles of the Empire. We should educate the Mongolians to mingle with the rest of the world. I think it is a mistake to say they will confine themselves to British Columbia. We are asked why do they go to British Columbia; the reason is clear, it is because they could not get any further, but it is notorious that of late years they are working east, and when the railroad is finished they will come further east. I think it is wholly inconsistent with our system of legislation that we should seek to discriminate against the Chinese. Take that instance referred to by the hon. member for New Westminster, (Mr. McInnes) of the Chinaman who settled in

Belleville, and who has property there, and has a family of children who are native Canadians, and yet those children have not the right to vote because their mother married a Chinaman.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I certainly would think the case referred to would be a hard case, and that the sons should be allowed to vote; but I do not think that for one case of this kind we should send the Bill back for the purpose of amending it.

The clause was agreed to.

On the 3rd clause.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Referring to sub-section B, it seems to me it discriminates in favor of a party that is not qualified. If the father dies and the property is not sufficient to qualify all the children one or two will qualify, according to the value of the property. It is quite clear that the moment the father is dead the children are his heirs, and if he dies without a will they have an equal share in the property. Take for instance a property worth $500, and there are 10 children, and each child shares to the amount of $50—the eldest and the second and third have no more property than the others, and I do not see why those parties should be qualified to vote when other parties, say ten persons, who have bought a property in partnership worth $500 could not. Why in this case should not one, two or three of them be qualified to vote, as one, two or three sons of the farmers who are qualified on the same amount of property?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think it is in furtherance of the franchise; it increases the franchise. The provision seems to be that where a man dies his sons living upon the place have a right to vote at the following elections, provided there is sufficient property to qualify them to vote. This supposes a case where the registration is finished, and the man dies before the election; if the election takes place soon after his death, if there is property enough to qualify, say three of the sons to vote, they can do so, but if there is only enough property to qualify one, only one can vote.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—It seems to me the moment the father dies the sons are only proprietors of a part of the real estate worth $50. I think that is widening the right too much.

HON. MR. POWER—As I understand the clause, if a man owns a farm and leaves by will all his property to his daughters, and has also sons who continue to live on the farm, these men who have no interest in the property at all except their residence there, under this clause have a right to vote.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—They have no interest in the father's lifetime. It is a vote given to them in consideration of residing on the farm and being concerned in the welfare of the country.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I give notice that I will move an amendment to that clause at the 3rd reading.

The clause was adopted.

On the 5th clause,

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Is it not likely that disputes will arise on the question of occupation? This clause may give rise to a good deal of wrong-doing. The Crown has at its disposal large tracts of land, and if they should be evil disposed, as members of the Ministry sometimes are, large grants might be made to persons a year before an election, and a great deal of wrong might be done in that way.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We have had that qualification in Ontario for a long time, and I have never known any abuse to creep in. There are certain persons having license of occupation—lock keepers, bridge keepers, &c. They have a license to occupy the property. There are also persons who occupy land under license from the Crown at fortified places like Kingston.

HON. MR. SCOTT—They would not have a vote in the past if they were not paying taxes.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I know a member of the other Chamber

who has quite a large house on land which he has leased from the Crown.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not think those people had votes under the Ontario Act.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Not where the land is not taxed.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—But it would be taxed. I know there are ten or twelve persons who have houses at Kingston, near Fort Henry, on land which they hold in that way. They do not own the land but they are taxed.

The clause was adopted.

On clause seven,

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I wish to point out what I conceive to be a grave objection to this clause in principle and in practice. In principle, the land confers the franchise on the farmers' sons without reference to their fitness at all. Suppose the land should not be of sufficient value, while the sons might be desirable voters, the land may not be sufficient to qualify them, or it may happen that there is some encumbrance on it for which neither the owner nor his sons is blameable; it may be an accident of the situation, but that encumbrance prevents two or three eligible persons from voting. Has the Minister of Justice any proposition to offer to prevent such an anomaly?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not understand the difficulty.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Suppose a farm worth say $2,000 is encumbered to the extent of $1,400 or $1,500, and that there is not value enough left unencumbered to qualify the owner and his sons to vote?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It does not depend on the encumbrance at all; it depends on the value of the property on the assessors roll—how much an acre it is worth, whether it is mortgaged or not.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Then I point to another difficulty. You bring the mortgagee into the question, and he may exercise an undue influence on the parties.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—If he is the man in possession he votes; if he is not he does not vote. You cannot prevent a creditor exercising influence on a debtor.

The clause was adopted.

On the 9th clause,

HON. MR. POWER—This is the clause which exempts British Columbia and Prince Edward Island from the operation of the law to a certain extent. I do not know why those two provinces should be excepted more than the other provinces. In New Brunswick a very large number of persons will be disfranchised by the operation of this Bill.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is to be an amendment offered to that, and had we not better defer the discussion until the amendment is proposed?

HON MR. POWER—Do you propose to amend it?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, but I understand the hon. member from Prince Edward Island to say, in his speech the other day, that he would move an amendment.

The clause was adopted.

On the 10th clause,

HON. MR. POWER—Sub-clause C excludes Indians in Manitoba, British Columbia, Keewatin, and the North-West Territories, and any Indian on any reserve elsewhere in Canada, who is not in possession and occupation of a separate and distinct tract of land in such reserve, and whose improvements on such separate tract are not of the value of at least one hundred and fifty dollars, and who is not otherwise possessed of the qualifications entitling him to be registered on the list of voters under this Act. I think, in the interest of uniformity, the Indian ought to be allowed to vote every-

where on the same qualification as the white man. The fact is, the object of this Bill is, as is quite well understood, to retain the present Ministry in power. Hon. gentlemen may pretend to think it is not, but there can be no doubt about it. What is the object of allowing Indians to vote in Ontario? Is it not simply because there are some half-dozen constituencies where it is thought the Indian vote, when coached by the Indian agent, will be strong enough to defeat the Reform candidate.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Oh, no.

HON. MR. SCOTT—To kill Paterson.

HON. MR. POWER—Yes, to kill Paterson, and the hon. member from Bothwell, and others.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Not at all.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not mean to say that that is the object of the hon. gentleman from Niagara, as I have no doubt he is actuated solely by an enthusiastic love and admiration for our red brethren. I cannot understand why that love and admiration do not go further—why they do not reach the red man in Manitoba. Is he not as good a man, or pretty nearly as good, as the red man in Ontario? Talking about British Columbia, I do not venture to say that the hon. gentleman opposite who has referred to the Indians there is wrong, but I have always understood that the Hyda Indians were about as intelligent,ingenious and industrious as any Indians in Canada.

HON. MR. NELSON—They are known to a certain extent for their intelligence and ingenuity, but nevertheless they are savages at the same time—strictly savages. We have had a visit from a gentleman who lives on that northern coast, who has brought a couple of Indians with him but I may tell the hon. gentleman these are not specimens of the Indians of British Columbia. They have become civilized and are under the care of the gentleman who brought them here. Although the Indians of Queen Charlotte's Island have shown great aptitude in the way of being jewellers and workers in metal to a certain extent, still they remain as they did —perhaps not as great savages as they were before the white man came there, but almost as great.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—The hon. gentleman from Halifax has made a mistake as to the Hyda Indians. The Indians he refers to are Tsimpsheans at Metlakatlah, who might well be enfranchised. I saw those men 25 years ago when they were cannibals and pagans living in wigwams partly under the ground. To-day they are living in houses two stories high, comfortably furnished, and they have saw-mills, blacksmith shops, etc. On Sunday you see an Indian mount the pulpit and read a text from the Bible in English, and address a respectable, well-dressed and orderly congregation. You hear the Indians playing the harmonium, and you see the women comfortably clad. They are able to weave and spin and are proficient in other civilized occupations. You find amongst them blacksmiths, carpenters and other mechanics. Those are the only Indians in British Columbia that ought to be enfranchised.

HON. MR. POWER—Then why do you not include them in this Bill?

HON. MR. MACDONALD—There is time enough for that: the Bill can be amended. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa was not here and did not hear the description which the hon. member from Niagara gave of the Indians of Ontario.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman from Ottawa was born in Ontario and knows all about the Indians of Ontario.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—Then the hon. gentleman from Ottawa should not speak of them as he has done. But with regard to our Indians I say the tribe to which I have referred are the only Indians fit to vote.

HON. MR. POWER—It all goes to show that when we undertook to take the right of deciding who shall vote away from the provinces, we immediately

plunged ourselves into all sorts of difficulties and inconsistencies. The only reason given for introducing this measure in the other House was that it was desirable that we should have a uniform franchise, but nature, and the circumstances, and the prejudices of the people of the different provinces are too strong, and it is impossible to have the desired uniform franchise. I think the better way to avoid those absurdities, as we are going to have a general franchise, would be to put the Indian in the same position as the white man.

HON. MR. PLUMB—That is what we are trying to do.

HON. MR. POWER—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, it is not so.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—That is what this clause was put in for.

HON. MR. POWER—The Consolidated Indian Act which we passed last year provides that under certain circumstances Indians can become enfranchised. I think that every facility ought to be offered to intelligent and industrious Indians to become enfranchised—to get from under the control of the Indian Office—and then every Indian who is qualified in the same way as the white man is qualified should have a right to vote, and I think that is the only logical and fair way to put it—make no distinction of race at all.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I see there is a discrepancy between the hon. gentleman and his leader.

The clause was adopted.

On the 13th clause,

HON. MR. POWER—I give notice that I will move an amendment to that clause. This officer should not prepare the list. The same person should not prepare and revise. The name that you give the officer is a misnomer. You call him a revising barrister when he is not a revising barrister: he is a list maker

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is only the first list.

HON. MR. POWER—I am calling attention to that. I think the proper way would have been to let the municipal officers make up the list in the first place, and let the revising barrister do what the revising barrister in England does—revise the list made up by the local authorities. As the clause is going through committee I wish to call attention to it, and say that that is one of the clauses to which I think an amendment should be moved at the third reading. I think the Minister himself must feel that the proper way would be to let the local officers make the lists.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, I do not agree with the hon. gentleman at all, but I will reserve my explanation until the third reading.

HON. MR. POWER—It would not take so long to discuss it now.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I will undertake not to be so long as the hon. gentleman generally is.

HON. MR. POWER—The course adopted in the other House was to discuss these matters in committee and to put the amendments and votes on record at the third reading.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think a better suggestion is the one made by the hon. member from Ottawa—that the discussion should take place on the third reading when the amendments are moved.

The clause was adopted.

On the 14th clause,

HON. MR. TRUDEL—I would suggest that after the provision concerning the Province of Quebec—that either a judge of the Superior Court, an advocate or a notary of the province shall act—the Minister should add the names of judges of the sessions, of the peace, recorders and stipendiary magistrates. I have received a letter from a gentleman well versed in these matters, and he agrees with my suggestion. I think it should be taken into consideration.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, I will take it into consideration and mention it to my colleagues.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—In some towns of the province perhaps these might be the men best qualified for the work and the appointment would be optional, of course.

The clause was adopted.

On the 43rd clause,

HON. MR. POWER—This is a very important clause; there is a general provision there that the revising officer shall not be bound by strict rules of evidence or forms of procedure, but shall hear and determine all matters coming before him in a summary manner, and so as in his judgment to do justice to all parties.

HON. MR. PLUMB—There is an appeal from his decision.

HON. MR. POWER—I think that the revising officer being a lawyer should be governed by the rules of evidence.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—In this case where the party is settling the list of voters, some allegation may be made, which if the rules of evidence were to be followed would take a long time to prove. The question of a man's title to his farm, for instance, would be very tedious and expensive to prove under the rules of evidence; but it might be established under rules which might have the force of having completely established it to the satisfaction of the revising officer, without legal evidence. It is to provide for cases of this kind that the revising officer is not to be bound by strict rules of evidence or forms of procedure.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—If the evidence is not legal, then an appeal would be of no use. Are we to understand that an appeal will lie even on those proceedings?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—So I understand.

The clause was agreed to.

On the 49th clause,

HON. MR. POWER—Thisclause begins by saying, "In case where the revising officer is not also a judge of any court." I have not noticed in any early part of the Bill a definition of the word judge, or any definition of court.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, in the 14th clause it is defined what the judge is to be.

HON. MR. POWER—It does not seem to confine the judge to the officer described in the 14th clause.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The officer described in the 14th clause is the only one who can be appointed.

HON. MR. POWER—The revising officer might happen to be a justice of the peace and he would be a judge.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The officer referred to here means the judge referred to in any of the preceding sections.

HON. MR. POWER—It says "A judge of any court," then supposing the Government appoint a man who is simply a magistrate, as a revising barrister.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That cannot happen. A man who is simply a magistrate cannot be appointed as a revising barrister. He must be a lawyer of five years' standing; and when he is a barrister of five years' standing there would be an appeal from him. If he is a judge there would be no appeal.

HON. MR. POWER—That appeal might be defeated by appointing some one who is only an inferior judge.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The kind of judges are pointed out and no other can be appointed.

HON. MR. POWER—In this clause it says "A judge of any court."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There are several courts mentioned in the Bill, and when you say a judge of any court, it means a judge of any of those courts mentioned.

HON. MR. GOWAN—The 14th section of the Act provides that the revising officer to be appointed in every Province except Quebec and British Columbia, shall be either a judge, or junior judge, of some county or district court, and in reading this 49th clause, any lawyer would read it with reference to the general provision.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Is it possible that the Minister of Justice intends that this law should go into operation with a clause in it which anticipates that if the revising officer is a judge he cannot make a mistake, and that there shall be no appeal against his decision? Is that really the decision of the Minister of Justice?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Then I think it is a very bad provision.

HON SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There must be finality somewhere, and if you cannot get it in the court where are you to get it?

The clause was agreed to.

On the 57th clause,

HON. MR. POWER—I see by this clause that the first lists are to be filed before 1st of August, 1886. The Prime Minister has given notice in the other Chamber that he has decided not to push this session the measure which is to provide for the payment of those officers. Does not the Minister of Justice think it is a very objectionable thing to have those officers appointed to make up the lists under this Bill without any definite salary? Does it not leave those officers still more under the control of the Government than they would be if their salaries were fixed in advance? Here are hundreds of men making up electoral lists all over the country, knowing that their salaries depend upon the good will of the Government of the day. Can the Opposition, and the people who are not going to pay the money expect to get much fair play under those circumstances? Does it not render the appointment of the county judges less valuable? If the remuneration that they are to receive for these services depends on the good will of the Government, and is not publicly fixed until after the lists are made up, there is every inducement for the officers to make the lists in such a way as to be most acceptable to the Government. I think it is very much to be regretted that the Premier has withdrawn that measure, because if that Bill had been passed there would have been a certain show of independence about the revising officers.

HON. MR. DICKEY—My hon. friend will see that this Act is not to take effect until next year.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The expectation is that most of the work of preparing the lists will be done by the judges without any remuneration at all. Where there is remuneration Parliament will determine how much that remuneration shall be.

HON. MR. POWER—Parliament means the Prime Minister.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It cannot mean that; the hon. gentleman is very much out of order indeed. The remuneration will be settled by the same power that passes this Bill. So long as a judge does the duty of preparing the lists there can be no suspicion, and I do not think it is fair to attach suspicion to people who are to act as officers, that they are going to discharge their duties erroneously and make mistakes on purpose, because they are to be paid by the Government or by anybody else. It seems to me to be a very unfair impression to create against the officers who will perform this service. The Premier is satisfied that he can have the work done in most places by the county court judges.

HON. MR. POWER—It is all very well to be charitable, and it may strike the Minister of Justice that I am a little uncharitable but I do not think so. It is only by being suspicious and watchful—

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That we can preserve our liberties.

HON. MR. POWER—That we can be free. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that not long ago

the hon. gentleman who now leads the House, and the other hon. gentlemen who are prepared to take so much on trust at present were very suspicious of other people, and with much less reason than we have to be suspicious of the officers who are to be created under this Bill. For instance it will be remembered that a few years ago this Chamber re-echoed with denunciations of a certain transaction in connection with steel rails, where the whole thing was a most uncharitable and unreasonable suspicion and nothing else.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Do not let us go back to that now, please.

HON. MR. POWER—Why not go back to it?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—One reason is that the hon. gentleman from Quinte is not now in his place, and he knew all about it.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman who leads the House was also one of the suspicious ones, although he did not express himself so violently as some others. In that instance, the House had to deal with a man of the highest and well known integrity; still they were ready to suspect all kinds of horrible things, and this House appointed committees to find out if there was any corruption in cases when there was less reason for suspicion than there is here. In party politics the only way to get along seems to be for one side to suppose that the other side are prepared to commit any kind of rascality that will help them along; and, as regards the present Government, I think that rule is a good and sound one, and I am afraid the Liberal party have not acted upon it sufficiently in the past.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I think we ought to apply the same rigid rule upon all occasions and at all times, and then it imputes nothing to anybody in particular. I think it ought to be the duty of every Legislature to anticipate all possible knavery and corruption, and so frame our laws that such ends may be rendered impossible. I do not cast a special imputation on the Government; I want to make it so that the people will have confidence in the integrity of those Courts, and to make it impossible for the officers to commit in that case possibly a crime. I think it is a great mistake to presuppose that a revising barrister may be guilty of an error. There is an appeal from the barrister, and none from the judge, though all men are liable to error.

The clause was agreed to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the Committee rise and report the Bill.

HON. MR. TRUDEL called attention to the fact that the qualification of a tenant in the city, an annual rental of $20, or a monthly rental of $2, was the same as the qualification of a tenant in the county. He thought the qualification of a tenant in the county should be proportionately lower than that of a tenant in the city.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—As to the qualification of a rental of $2 per month, it is very low, and includes almost everybody; but there is a certainty that a man who pays $2 a month has got what is called a permanent interest in the country.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. READ, from the Committee, reported the Bill without any amendment.

CONSOLIDATED MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of Bill (152), "An Act to amend the Consolidated Militia Act of 1883."

HON. MR. TRUDEL—I do not think it is a proper policy to increase the Mounted Police. I think it would be far better to create a regular army, no matter how small it may be. In fact I do not think the general feeling of the country is very favorable to the Mounted Police, and there are many doubts as to their efficiency. I think it would be better to

have regular military, put under the rules, and discipline, and control of the military authority, than to have the Mounted Police under control of the Department of the Interior. I only mention this because the hon. Minister of Justice knows that amongst the papers which have been brought before Parliament, it has been very properly said—I think by Bishop McLean, of Saskatchewan—that the Mounted Police were the cause of the rebellion. I think it is said as clearly as it can be said, and I admit frankly that it is my opinion that if there had never been mounted police in the North West there would have been no rebellion. Hon. gentlemen will remember that at the commencement of the trouble many people believed that the mounted police would be able to put a stop to it, but we all know how inefficient they proved. I am ready to believe that they are men of great merit and perfect character and so on—I do not mean to reflect in any way upon them personally, but I speak of the system, and when trouble occurred we at once found that the only force we had at our disposal to deal with this difficulty were the forces at the command of the Militia Department. I hope that the Government will take this matter seriously into consideration. I think it is the general feeling in the country that the time has come when Canada should have its army. It may be a small army, but it would be a better way of defending the country than enrolling men in the mounted police.

HON. MR. READ—I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman when he states that had there been no Mounted Police in the North-West there would have been no rebellion. The police could not have caused the rebellion. They certainly did not cause the raiding of the stores, the rifling of private property, and the taking possession of Government property. Then as to the efficiency of the police, it is true that a portion of them were at Prince Albert and remained there; but what would have become of the people of Prince Albert if they had left them; and what would have become of other places if the police were not there to protect them? As far as I have been able to judge, I think the police have shown themselves to be most efficient. What could a handful of men in a vast country like that do? The force has been small; but it has been efficient for its numbers. There was a time when there was an enquiry as to what the police were doing at Prince Albert when they were required elsewhere. No doubt they were acting under orders, and there is no complaint of a want of action on their part when their services were required.

HON. MR. WARK—It appears that some hon. gentlemen are mistaken about this Bill; its object is to increase the infantry force, instead of the Mounted Police. I might remark that in reading the general report, I consider that our militia ought to be made much more effective than it is. I was struck with the general remarks at the close of the commander's report. He speaks of the short time devoted by the militia to acquiring a knowledge of drill, and says:—

"Under the present arrangement of only calling out the rural regiments every second year, the men composing them have only, at most, two trainings during their service of three years, that is, if they happen to enlist during the year of the training and before it takes place. If they enlist just after the training, then they have only one during their whole service, which means eight days' actual drill; because, though nominally they have now twelve days, yet out of that, one day for joining and one day for leaving and two Sundays must be allowed. The consequence is that these men go back to civil life with such a faint smattering of the duties of a soldier that it fades away, and if an emergency should arise and these men were called back to service, they would have to be treated as recruits; whereas, if they had twelve days' steady drill each year for three years, they would be none the worse citizens and would carry with them enough knowledge of a soldier's life to render them fit to join the ranks at once, if the necessity of calling them out again should arise."

It strikes me that it would be much better when the Militia pass through their three years' training that they should be still enrolled as a reserve, but different from the ordinary reserve. When enrolled for three years longer they should be occasionally called out for drill, left in possession of their rifles, and furnished with ammunition to keep up their practice, and if called out once every couple of years, there would be, instead of 45,000, as at present, a force of 90,000 men, who knew something of the duties of soldiers,

and could be called upon for active service, if required. It is time that this Dominion should assert its position in the world, and show that it is able to take care of itself. When there was a prospect of war in the East recently, we were in a very unprepared state if it had broken out. There are two things we ought to be prepared for: that is, to protect our coal deposits on the Atlantic, and our coal deposits on the Pacific. Both our own commerce and the commerce of the Empire would greatly depend on those deposits of coal, and they would have to be protected so that Her Majesty's steamers would be able to coal at any time. This would give them a superiority over every other power, and we have more at stake than any other country, in consequence of the immense fleet both of Great Britain, and of the Dominion. I would suggest, therefore, whether it would not be desirable that instead of allowing the men to go back into civil life after three years' training, it would not be better to keep them enrolled, and to so change the law as to continue their enrolment for three years, which would increase the force of active militia to 90,000 men, who have already passed through their regular training. We are now a people of some 5,000,000 population, and it is a question whether we ought not to keep such a force, and have it ready for any emergency. I have no doubt, and there seems not to be any doubt in any quarter, that a war with Russia is imminent. She has been preparing for it for half a century. Within a very short time she has advanced 1,000 miles nearer the Indian frontier, and there is now only one territory, that of Afghanistan, between her and India.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I quite agree with my hon. friend in what he has said. I am not in harmony with any person who may wish to throw discredit upon our police force in the North-West. I believe they have been very efficient. I know a number of them from Nova Scotia and they are good men, and from what I have heard of those from the other provinces a better class of men could not be selected in the country for such service. When we proposed the establishment of "A" and "B" batteries, the Opposition were opposed to it; but events have proved how fortunate it was that we had this nucleus of a regular army ready to send to the North-West at the breaking out of the rebellion. The question for the country now, is whether our defences will not have to be greatly increased.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—The occurrences in the North-West last spring have demonstrated that the present system is not equal to our necessities. Though our volunteers have done their duty, and have shown themselves equal to the emergency, many of them are married men, and after the war is all over we will be at great expense to provide pensions to widows and orphans. I would suggest that a better system would be to have certain companies of unmarried men recruited from the other companies of the force, to be drilled so many days in the year, so that in an emergency like that of last spring, they would be always ready for active service, and they would have no families to be supported by private contribution, and in case of death they would leave no one dependent upon public assistance.

HON. MR. POWER—One objection that I have to this measure is that it is calculated to very largely increase the expenses connected with the protection of this country. The other day we passed a bill which provides for an increase of the Mounted Police force to 1,000 men. I understand from the Minister that each of these men will cost about $800. a year. Now we are providing for an increase of the standing army to 1,000 men, and I presume the cost of each man will be about the same. Hon. gentlemen will see then that we have at once for the mere *personnel* of our standing army—because after all the Mounted Police force are really part of the standing army—an annual expenditure of $1,600,000. Now this is very nearly double what the service used to cost the country ten years ago. When the Bill was at the second reading I suggested that it was not desirable to make the addition to the force all infantry. The experience of the recent outbreak has shown that the great want of the country is cavalry. I think it is a pity that the Government, when they were making provision to increase the army at all, did not

provide for cavalry. The proper thing for the Government to do, instead of coming to us asking us to tax the country so many hundreds of thousands of dollars more in order to add to the standing army, would be to see that a militia force is organized in the North-West. There were volunteer companies in the North-West which the Government allowed to disband; and whose arms they called in not very long ago. What I think the Government should do is to place the North-West country, where trouble is much more likely to arise than in any other part of the country, in the same position as the older provinces, and to have a respectable volunteer force there. Notwithstanding what has been said by the hon. gentleman from DeLanaudière I think that this recent outbreak, instead of making us think less of our volunteer forces, is calculated to make us think a great deal more of them. The volunteers with a few weeks' training and experience were at least as efficient soldiers as the Mounted Police; and I did not notice that there was any distinction made between the volunteers and the regulars. I do not see that it was claimed that the regulars were any better in the field than the volunteers. The eastern provinces of Canada have paid immense sums of money since that North-West country was acquired for the purpose of building railroads through it, having it surveyed and making it fit and suitable for a population, and now that population have got in there I think it is unreasonable that we should be called upon to do the work which these people ought to do for themselves. There is a sufficient white population in the North-West now to protect themselves against the half-breeds and against the Indians too, and I think by far the better plan would be to allow those people to form volunteer corps, and to protect themselves and not tax us down here for the purpose of protecting them. It is quite right that we should do our share of it, but I think it is unreasonable that our taxation should be so very largely increased for the purpose of doing for those people what they can do for themselves, and what they are, as we learn, willing and anxious to do for themselves. Whether the Government are unduly suspicious of the loyalty of the whites out there I cannot say, but they certainly, instead of encouraging these people to form volunteer corps, have discouraged them and taken their arms away from them; and it would be much better now while the warlike spirit is strong there thatwe should form volunteer corps in that country and let them bear the expense of protecting themselves.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think the hon. gentleman from De Salaberry (Mr. Trudel) intended to reflect on the Mounted Police in the way understood. I think he meant that they were the first persons who got into actual trouble, and if they had not fired there would have been no disturbance at all at Duck Lake.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—No, I did not specially allude to that point. I took care to explain that the remarks which I was making were meant to apply to the system and not to persons forming part of the Mounted Police. I added that I was ready to admit that personally they had done their duty, and I had nothing to say against any of them, but I said I believed that that kind of a force would be advantageously replaced by regular troops under the control of the Militia Department and under military discipline. I do not know much about it, but it seems to me that this Mounted Police force is something between the civil and the military; I suppose to a certain extent they are under military discipline, but still they are not under control of officers of a regular army. It is a body which does not present the advantage of an army or of a defence which might be afforded by a body of citizens such as the volunteers. I learn from parties in the North-West, at least I understood it this way—that if there had been no Mounted Police in that country there would have been no disaffection, because it was the presence of the police that created disaffection amongst the half-breeds, in the first instance. I do not mean to say that the Mounted Police did not do their duty—or that as a matter of fact they did not in many instances protect the citizens, and so on. I admit that it was a great satisfaction for the settlers to have somebody to rely upon, and I repeat again that what I said was against the system. I said,

instead of the Mounted Police the Government should create or augment a regular force under the rules and discipline of a regular army and under the command of regular officers. I have been informed by parties who are competent to judge of such matters that the Mounted Police might be more efficient if it were under the control of the Militia Department, and I can understand that readily, because in the Militia Department we have regular officers who belong to the military profession, whereas in the Department of the Interior, under whose control the Mounted Police are placed, we have only civilians: so that the highest authority being vested in the Minister of the Interior and his orders not going through superior officers, as in the case of the Militia Department, the proper control and action of a regular officer is not felt, which I think is a disadvantage.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I would like the Minister to state expressly whether the Mounted Police were immediately under command of the Major-General, when he made his appearance on the field?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, they were. The Mounted Police, at a certain stage in the operations in the North-West—I think after the engagement at Fish Creek, and before that at Batoche—were put under the control of the commander of the forces there. We passed a Bill for that purpose and gave the officers of the Mounted Police the same comparative rank in the army. The whole force was put under the control of the Major-General, and he had command of them as completely as he had command of any other portion of the troops: so that in that respect they were soldiers. The Mounted Police had done good service in the North-West, and I was anxious that it should not go to the country that the hon. member for DeSalaberry thought differently. I have again and again heard—and I am sure members of this House have seen frequently—encomiums on the Mounted Police for their efficiency, not with reference to the recent disturbances, but with reference to the protection of settlers during the last three or four years—with reference to Indian troubles which were dreaded by the settlers—and I have seen it asserted more than once in letters from the North-West that people could not live in that country, were it not for the Mounted Police. Then they have been of immense value in preventing the sale of liquor. They have done a great deal of duty in that way and in enforcing law and order on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They have been of great value as policemen proper in arresting prisoners, and looking after marauders from the United States, and after offenders, such as cattle stealers, bringing them down to trial and taking them afterwards great distances to jails to which they were confined for punishment. In every way that policemen could be useful, and in many ways that no men but Mounted Police could have been of use, they have been of service. So I think the country is very much indebted to that branch of the service for the security which has so long obtained in the North-West. That they have in any degree provoked the rebellion my hon. friend did not assert, and I cannot believe anything of the kind took place. I suppose at that time any troops appearing on the scene would have precipitated the outbreak that took place. With regard to the control of the force it has all along been held by the Premier; he had control of the Mounted Police at the time he was Minister of Justice, and also at the time he was head of the Department of the Interior, and he has control of it now. It is not under the control of the Department of the Interior, but of the Premier. He having been originally placed in that position has carried it along ever since, and the administration, I believe, is very thorough. As to their being soldiers, there is no distinction between their drill and the drill of the soldiery—that is, the soldier learns all that the mounted policeman learns, and the mounted policeman learns all that the soldier does. They have additional duty as police inspectors and magistrates, some of them, and those are duties in excess of those of the soldiery, but the ordinary drill of a mounted policeman is very much the ordinary drill of a cavalry man.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Just at the breaking out of the rebellion the Government felt the necessity of making a change in their character and making them regular soldiers.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, in order that the Major-General might have complete command. Without that change the Mounted Police would have been under the control of their commander, Major Irving, and it was absolutely necessary that the Major-General should have control of all armed men in that country. That change only showed itself to be necessary after the disturbance had occurred, when it was very desirable to place all executive power of the militia, of every kind and description, completely in the hands of the Major-general, and therefore that arrangement was made. Whether the Mounted Police and the troops should be amalgamated or not is a question of the future. It does not seem to me that there is any great difficulty of amalgamating the Mounted Police with the cavalry corps to be raised in the North West, and I am disposed to think, as some hon. gentlemen do, that the true soldier for that duty is the mounted infantry man —that is, a soldier armed with rifle and revolver and drilled as a foot and cavalry man; but the House will perceive the thing is gradually coming about—that is, there is a cavalry school to be created at Winnipeg, and the Mounted Police, having a military position and military rank, are more a military force now than they have been in the past, and will hereafter rank more with the militia than has hitherto been the case: so I think the time is coming when the country will be represented up there, so far as military protection is concerned, by one force. I understand the Minister of Militia to favor having the Mounted Police and the Militia under his control, and that, it seems to me, is desirable, and that we should have one complete system of defence for the country. I believe we are gradually coming to that in the way I have pointed out. As to our doing anything to prevent the formation of military associations, or companies, or regiments in the North-West, the hon. gentleman from Halifax is mistaken I think.

HON. MR. POWER—No, not at all.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We have had two there which have been doing duty during the recent disturbance—the 90th and the 91st.

HON. MR. POWER—When I spoke of the North-West Territories I did not mean Manitoba.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is no population in the North-West Territories proper. You could not depend on forces raised there—the population there is chiefly Indians and half-breeds, and it would be impossible to get a regiment together. You could not get men enough.

HON. MR. POWER—There were two companies at Prince Albert and one at Battleford, and they were disbanded.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes I believe they were. So far as we were able safely to encourage military combinations there we did so.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ADOPTED.

HON. MR. READ moved the adoption of the 9th report of the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Printing of Parliament. He said: This report recommends that certain returns be printed and certain others be not printed, and it also recommends that Mr. Romaine, whose title appears to be Proof Reader, be entitled Superintendent of the Printing of the Sessional Papers of Parliament. That has been his office and it is merely giving him the proper title.

HON. MR. POWER—I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee whether some other officer was not supposed to hold the position in which they proposed to put Mr. Romaine. I got the impression that he was taking the place of somebody else?

HON. MR READ—No, it was merely that he was called a proof reader, when, in reality, his duty was superintending the printing of the sessional papers, and he does not supersede anyone else.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It is simply a change of name?

HON. MR. READ—It is simply to give him a standing, and his duties remain as before.

THE SENATE DEBATES.

SECOND REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ADOPTED.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE moved the adoption of the second report of the Committee on Reporting and Publishing the Debates of the Senate. He said: There are three recommendations in the report. The first is that the Debates be bound in two volumes this year, instead of one. It is expected that the report will extend to fourteen or fifteen hundred pages, and it would be too cumbrous if bound in one volume. The second is that an additional appropriation be asked for in order to meet the expense of printing, the appropriation voted last session being expended. The third is to grant the reporters, in addition to their contract price, a sum of $1,000, in consequence of the unusual length of the session. They receive, in addition to the bulk sum of their contract, for every page above a certain number, the sum of $3.50. This has not given them any profit during the past twelve weeks, owing to the character of the session. The amount which is here recommended is to recompense them for the length of the session. It will place them on the same footing as they will be under the new contract.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Does the hon. gentleman say that out of the $3.50 which they receive, they have no profit?

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—They have no profit after paying for the printing, and expenses of their office.

The motion was agreed to.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (146), "An Act to amend the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act 1883."

In the Committee,

On the 9th clause,

HON. MR. TRUDEL—This clause is less objectionable because of the amendments which have been added to it, but still I think it does not give satisfaction. The Minister of Justice has no doubt seen a petition which was signed by the whole trade of Montreal. I think there was no exception. The Bill was considered to favor to a great extent those who have large capital, and it is alleged that even with the amendment which has been made it does not put the new distilleries in a very favorable position. I was told that this provision was imported from Sweden: that a limitation was put on the sale, and the Government advanced to the manufacturers a certain percentage of the value of their goods in order not to interfere with their capital. Now, there is another consideration: this provision is made for the reason that some deleterious articles which are in the spirit disappear in the course of one or two years. By a chemical process this end can be attained, and then this amendment would have no reason to exist at all. I promised some of the parties interested to state the facts.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend, I think, either wrote or spoke to me about it before.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Yes, I communicated to the hon. gentleman a petition signed by the whole trade in Montreal.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—In consequence of objections to the clause as it originally stood the amendments were made in the House of Commons, and I understood the trade of Montreal were satisfied. As to the same effect being produced on the liquor by some chemical process as is produced by keeping it two years, I am disposed to think that that is not correct. I know there is some process by which they can take away the greater part of the fusil oil, but the effect of age is not given and the liquor is

much more deleterious by that process than it is after having been kept for two years, so I think it is a great advantage, even from that point of view, to have the liquor of the age that is spoken of, or a still greater age, and that the same result, as regards health, is not attained by eliminating the fusil oil by means of chemicals.

The clause was adopted.

HON. MR. VIDAL, from the Committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

At six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

CULLING TIMBER BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (154), "An Act further to amend the Acts relating to the culling and measuring of timber in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec." He said—The object of this bill is to empower the Governor in Council to make regulations in each department of the supervisor's office Provision is made for granting annuities not exceeding $200. per annum to such persons as are incapacitated by reason of age, infirmity or otherwise from pursuing their business of culling, or whose services are no longer required. In the ordinary affairs of life the man who gets too old for his business has not the advantage of $200 a year, but these men form part of a corporation, and there is no other way of dealing with them. There are more cullers than are necessary to measure the timber at Quebec, and the only way to reduce their number is to weed them out gradually. The old men fall first and it seems hard to discharge them without making this allowance. They are to be reduced in this way: the whole number shall not exceed 30, apportioned as follows, cullers of square timber 15, cullers of deals 12, cullers of staves, masts, spars, etc., 3. For the payment of the annuity to be granted, in the first place the fund of the corporation is to be charged, but if that fails, then it is to be charged to the consolidated revenue.

HON. MR. WARK—I do not know how it is that this business has got into the hands of the Dominion Government at all. We ship a good deal of lumber from the ports of New Brunswick, and the surveyors of that lumber are appointed by the local authorities. The corporation of St. John appoints the necessary staff there, and the local authorities at the several Gulf ports appoint their own cullers. I should think this is a matter belonging to Quebec, and the appointments up here ought to belong to the authorities of the city of Ottawa. I cannot see how the Dominion Government came to take this in hand more than the culling of timber in the lower provinces.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It has been proposed to take over the culling of timber in the lower provinces also. It is done under the power which enables this Parliament to deal with trade and commerce, and the greatest commerce of the country is in wood. There is this difficulty in dealing with the subject: when we were trying to consolidate the Statutes, we found that there was law in the Province of Ontario and Quebec in one direction, and in New Brunswick in another, and it became impossible to consolidate the law without repealing one or the other, and therefore the matter was put over for further specific legislation for the Dominion Parliament, but I think undoubtedly the subject lies within the province of the Dominion Parliament. It may be that no provision was made in New Brunswick by the legislature of the province, before Confederation, similar to the provision which existed in Canada when it was a province by itself, and this is only carrying out the provision of Canada in that respect. I think we might pursue the same course with New Brunswick when the time came to do so.

HON. MR. WARK—I do not think it is considered desirable to do so.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is desirable that there should be a uniform system of culling. Good timber exported from New Brunswick is not equal in quality to good timber exported from Quebec. Many years ago this matter was taken over by the Province of Canada as properly

falling within its powers, and by the Confederation Act it certainly falls within the province of this Parliament to deal with it.

HON. MR. PELLETIER—Is it well understood that the reduction of the number will be by mortality?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Gradually, in that way I believe. I think that is a provision which is made in subsection F; they are to be granted annuities when they are incapacitated by reason of age, infirmity or otherwise, for their duties.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (156) "An Act to restrict and regulate Chinese Immigration into Canada." He said: The restriction which this Bill contemplates is the imposing of a duty upon Chinese coming to this country; it is proposed that no Chinese shall land in any part of Canada who has not paid the sum of $50.

HON. MR. ALMON—Is it any part of Canada?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, any part of Canada, and the number who may enter is limited to one for every 50 tons of the vessel in which they come. It is copied from legislation in Australia, where the evil resulting from Chinese immigration has produced the same feeling that prevails now in British Columbia, and where the same step that is proposed to be taken by this Bill has been taken and approved by Her Majesty's Government. It is thought by Her Majesty's Government that it is within the power of the Legislature of Australia to take such a step—not to say that no Chinese shall enter the country, but to say that these Chinese who do shall come in subject to a certain duty, which there, as here, is put at $50. Now this is a very strong measure in the way of prevention, but the evil which is thought to result from the immigration of these people into the Dominion is very considerable, and it is the general desire, I think, in that part of the Dominion at all events, that it should be checked, and that the check which we contemplate should be the one to be imposed.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

HON. MR. ALMON—I would not have spoken on this measure if its operation had been confined to British Columbia. I think each province should be allowed to regulate its own private concerns as it thinks fit: but that British Columbia, containing 20,000 of a white population, and having but a small representation in Parliament, should compel Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces to pass a Bill which is contrary to the genius of the nineteenth century—which in the course of 20 years would be cast up to everyone as violating the laws of nature and of God—I think is claiming too much. What does this Bill do? You prevent the further immigration of Chinese into the Dominion. What is the objection to the Chinese? I have heard the objection stated that they take no part in our politics: but we have just passed a Bill to prevent them voting. I have heard also that they eat rats. When I was a boy and read Gilray's caricatures I used to think that the French ate nothing but frogs, but when I came to know them I found that they, like myself, ate everything that was good, and perhaps the same may be the case with the Chinese. To eat rats, I think, is no reason why these people should be kept out of the country. There are, I think, now 18,000 Chinamen in British Columbia, and you say to these people that no Chinese women shall be admitted into the country. You put a duty of $50 on every Chinese woman who comes into British Columbia and you keep those 18,000 men without their wives. What are you doing? Are you not encouraging vice? You say they are guilty of vices which cannot be named,

and yet you put a tax on Chinese women: is that a Bill which should be passed in the nineteenth century? I say no. Certainly it is our duty to go unto all nations and convert them to the Christian religion. How much easier is it to convert them when we can get them here, where they will learn our language and learn to read the Bible in English? You keep them out of this country: will they not pass retaliatory measures? Have they not done so already against the United States? Hereafter we cannot blame them if they prevent our missionaries going in and spreading the Gospel among them, I think if the British Columbians—and I am conceding to them a great deal more than I ought to do—were to restrict immigration into their own country it is going far enough, because I feel in the course of a very few years the public opinion of the civilized world will repeal this Act; but I think they have no right to say that the immigration of the Chinese into Nova Scotia will not take place. I wish we had a number of them there. If this Bill were restricted to British Columbia, and contained a statement that it is passed at the request of the inhabitants of British Columbia I should withdraw my objection. If is is not amended in that way I shall vote against it and be proud to have my name recorded, because I feel that after I am gone the civilized world will pronounce that I am right, and that the persons who voted for the measure did wrong.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD—The hon. gentleman does an injustice to British Columbia. They have not asked that this measure apply to the whole Dominion. They simply asked to have the restriction apply to their own province.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—That takes the sin of it from their shoulders.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD — They asked for a Bill applying to the Province of British Columbia, but the House of Commons have passed one for the whole Dominion. British Columbia asked for this legislation because it is a matter within the scope of the Dominion Parliament. As to what the hon. gentleman said on on the other hand I am in harmony with him, but on this Bill I have to yield my own opinion to the popular feeling in British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—It seems to me the Chinese have been a necessity in British Columbia for a long time. In the undeveloped condition of their resources they have found employment not only for their own people but for all others coming in. Without the Chinese I do not know what British Columbia would have done up to the present time. Now, they seem very desirous to prevent them coming into the country. They are no doubt an evil: they are not fit to enter into our social or political life, and do not seem desirous to do so, yet it is doubtful if this law is not too restrictive in its character. It is a question whether admitting only one person for every 50 tons is not too great a restriction.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN—I entirely sympathize with the remarks made by the junior member for Halifax upon the general question, but I presume if there was to be any legislation at all it had to be for the whole Dominion, and therefore there is no help for it; if British Columbia calls for legislation of this kind, it must be legislation for the whole Dominion. The experience of all of us who come from the western part of this province, is that those Chinese who live among us are a quiet, inoffensive, law-abiding population; they are industrious and thrifty, and make good citizens. So far as we are concerned we should be glad to have more instead of less of them, but in British Columbia the Chinese population have been made the subject of a very great grievance, and although I have taken pains to read the elaborate report on the subject, I confess, when I sat down, my mind was not clear as to whether they were an evil or a benefit.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—Does the hon. gentleman say he read it through?

Hon. Mr. ALLAN—Well I read a good deal of it, and my mind is not clear whether the Chinese are a blessing or a curse to British Columbia, but so far as

we are concerned, any legislation must be for the whole Dominion.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I concur in the sentiments expressed by the junior member from Halifax. I think it is entirely inconsistent with the very fundamental principles of the British constitution that legislation of this kind should find a place on the statute book. I was surprised when I first learned that the Imperial Government had sanctioned the introduction of such legislation in Australia. I cannot understand on what principle it has been approved of. It appears to me a kind of confession on the part of the Anglo-Saxon race, that they are afraid of the competition of the Mongolian race. I do not share this fear. My belief is if they came among us, we, with our superior civilization and our earnest desire to teach them the truth of the gospel, would have a powerful influence on those men. We know they are capable of being instructed in our civilization. We know by the actual result of religious missions established in China, that in many places they have been very successful. The only one that I have any special acquaintance with is the mission under the charge of the Canadian Presbyterian Church, and I know that that mission has been and is in the highest degree successful, that with very little assistance, indeed, from the white people the missionary there has, with the voluntary aid of his own converts, been able to build a large number of chapels and a college, and the work has been so successful that thousands have been brought from their pagan superstitions to embrace the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Now, why men who in the language of my hon. friend from Toronto are, as far as our own personal experience goes, quiet, law-abiding and peaceable citizens, should be placed under an embargo is what I cannot conceive. I do not at all agree to the principle, that because one particular province has taken a prejudice against these people or supposes itself to be injured by them, that all the other provinces should be required to sanction a law so utterly inconsistent with the well understood rights which every human being has when he steps on British soil. I cannot understand why such a distinction should be made, and why it should be levelled against an inoffensive and industrious people. I think it is a great pity that it has been thought desirable to place such a law on the Statute book. I am entirely opposed to such legislation, fruitless, as I presume, such opposition will be in the present case.

HON. MR. POWER—I am sorry to say that on the present occasion I cannot agree with my learned colleague. As British Columbia is the only province into which the Chinese have, so far, emigrated in any number, we are not in a position over here to judge as well as the people there, as to whether or not the Chinese are a desirable class of immigrants. Now, there seems to be almost an entire unanimity of sentiment amongst the people of British Columbia as to the undesirability of largely increasing the number of Chinese in that province. They have done good service in laying the foundation of what I hope will be the future greatness of a province, where the feeling of the people at large seems to be that it is not desirable the Chinese should come there in any greater numbers. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down said that he did not see any reason why the Chinese should be excluded. One of the reasons—I do not know whether it is a very cogent one—is that the Chinese when they come to British Columbia do not come, as white immigrants do, to make permanent homes there, and to become assimilated with the remainder of the population. As a rule, they come there for the purpose of making money, and after they have made a competence, returning to their own country. I do not think that that is a very serious drawback to Chinese immigration; and as long as we do not turn the Chinese who are in British Columbia out of the province, and do not impose any special penalties on them while they are there, but treat them as other inhabitants of the province, I do not see that they have very much reason to complain, if we restrict Chinese immigration. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has spoken of the probability that large numbers of Chinese might be converted to Christianity in British Columbia. It is true, as that hon. gentleman has said, that there are a great many Christians in China. The Chinese mem

bers of the church to which I belong number somewhere between one and a half and two millions; but I am afraid that the example which is shown the Chinese by the whites in British Columbia is not calculated to lead them into the true path, and I do not think it is in the moral interest of the Chinese that they should come into that Province in large numbers. I think the interests of the Province and the interests of the Chinese are one in that respect.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that the people of British Columbia are just as moral in their living and as high-toned as the people of Halifax, man for man. The great danger from the Chinese is this, that the country is so populous that there is every probability, unless immigration is checked, of overrunning our whole colony, and instead of having British Columbia an Anglo-Saxon colony we will have it Mongolian. I do not think they are any worse in running down the rates of labor, or anything of that kind than Europeans. They are as moral and industrious and law-abiding as other people, but there is a danger of their overrunning the country.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—If I vote for this Bill, I will certainly do so against my conscience; but inasmuch as it is a Government measure I would like to support it. If I did so, however, I would be acting inconsistently with my feelings. We, who pride ourselves on the freedom of our institutions, and the abolition of slavery in the United States, and who fancy we are going over the world with our lamp in our hand shedding light and lustre wherever we go—that we should become slave-drivers, and prohibit strangers from coming to our hospitable shore because they are of a different colour and have a different language and habits from ourselves, in deference to the feelings of a few people from British Columbia, is a thing I cannot understand. I do not see why we should suffer in the other provinces because of that prejudice in British Columbia. If this Bill were confined to British Columbia alone, I should be happy that the people of that Province should have their own way in the matter; but why they should enforce such a law on the Dominion is something I cannot understand.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—I would ask the Minister of Justice does this Bill restrict the immigration of Chinese who come from Hong Kong? I believe they are British subjects there, and I would like to know if this measure would deprive them of the right of coming over to this country?

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—It applies to all Chinamen.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—Then I say that to deprive, in this country, a British subject from coming to our shores is a restriction we are not in a position to demand or enforce.

Hon. Mr. WARK—Before this question arose in Canada, it was discussed for several years in the United States, and there was a great difference of opinion there between the people of California and the people on this side of the mountains. The different Christian churches had been sending out, at great expense, missionaries to labor amongst the heathen population of China, and many of them looked upon it as a wise dispensation of Providence, the bringing of a number of those people under the influence of Christianity in a Christian country. They were desirous of sending, and some of them did send, missionaries amongst them when they reached the American shore, but there was a class of laborers on the Pacific coast, who immediately made a great stir because the Chinese lowered the wages; and it was with them chiefly, and with the class of people who supported them, that the difficulty arose at first. But the Christian people who wished to do good to the Chinese were not at all opposed to their landing on the American continent, because they believed that if they could bring them under Christian influences here, a great many of them would return to their own country as Christians, and would spread the doctrines of Christianity amongst their own people much more rapidly than by sending missionaries across the ocean. I do not know what the people of British Columbia have

done towards improving the character of those people, and leading them to give up their heathen practices, and inducing them to embrace the Christian religion, but they should do something of that kind and show the Chinese that they really desire to benefit them, and if they did return to their own country to send them back under Christian influences, and in a position to benefit their fellow countrymen. I do not think that this is judicious legislation. I know that at the time we levied an immigrant tax of $2 a head many years ago it was done for a different object; it was to provide a fund out of which to support such of those who landed on our shores as were sick and unable to support themselves. It was not done with a view to keeping them out of the country; we were desirous of seeing them come. Now that the Canadian Pacific Railway is being opened, my impression is that if the Chinese were let alone they would come across the mountains and settle upon the lands of the west, and coming within Christian influences, would probably mix up with our own people and become valuable settlers. From what I understand of their habits they are a very industrious people. At any rate if a Chinaman, with his wife, comes to settle in the country he ought not to be prohibited, whatever you may do with that class that come merely as workmen to make money and carry away their wages.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—The greatest objection that I have heard to the Chinese is that those who come to British Columbia are bound by secret societies, and are engaged to certain companies and are not at liberty; they are, in fact, practically slaves to those companies. On the other side of the question there is no doubt that the Government, in this country, as in other countries, have passed laws to prevent paupers and convicts from coming to our shores. To that extent I think it is perfectly right to prevent those Chinese who are known to be of that character from coming in amongst us; but if a Chinaman is an honest, industrious man, and comes to work here, I do not think we are acting up to the principles of Christianity in refusing to allow him to settle amongst us, or putting such a heavy tax upon him as we are imposing under the provisions of this Bill. Would it not be better to oblige those people to bring with them certificates from the British Consuls in the Chinese ports as to their character, and when we are assured by such certificates that they do not belong to any secret societies and are freemen, why should we oblige them to pay this heavy tax? I agree entirely with the hon. gentleman from Sarnia that it is not according to the principles of Christianity to treat any people as we are treating the Chinese in this measure, and in the measure respecting the electoral franchise

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend from Sarnia, and my hon. friend who has just sat down, speak as theorists and as philanthropists; but take those who have dealt with Chinese immigration practically in Australia and they will find that the very law that we seek to have passed here has been enacted in that colony. There was a great deal of difficulty about it, and for a time there was a great deal of doubt as to whether it would receive the assent of Her Majesty's Government. It was pressed again and again, and after repeated efforts it finally did receive the assent of Her Majesty's Government.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—That was a tax.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, it was a tax. Then take the case of the people of British Columbia. My hon. friend opposite tells what the feeling of the people of that province is. There is the position of people who have to deal practically with this subject. We in Ontario and Quebec and in the eastern provinces, generally, have not to deal with the subject practically; with us it is a question of theory. Hon. gentlemen say why should not the Chinese be allowed to come into the country? One reason given by the member for British Columbia is that he population of China is so great that if we open the door and allow them to come in as they please, you will have a Chinese instead of an Anglo-Saxon population in that province. We dono t feel that here; we do not feel that there is any danger from it; but supposing there was not a danger from it, suppos-

ing we were situated as they are in British Columbia or in Australia, and we were afraid the whole country was to be overrun with Chinese, we would feel that we should put a stop to it, that we wanted the country to be a British colony, and we would not like to see the Chinese taking possession of all the avenues of labor and wealth. That is the practical aspect of the question, and it is with that aspect of the question we have to deal, and we are dealing with it just as our fellow colonists did in Australia, by imposing a reasonable tax on all Chinese coming into the country.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Can we restrict Chinese from Hong Kong coming over ?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think we can ; they are British subjects.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—When the Minister of Justice rose to explain the nature and object of this Bill, it at once struck me as being of un unusual character, and I was surprised that the Imperial authorities had not stepped in to prevent the introduction of such a measure, until my hon. friend explained that it was favored by the Imperial authorities in Australia. It seems to me that any country situated as Canada is, with a province so near to China on the Pacific coast, is clearly entitled to put in operation such regulations, as regards immigration, as she finds necessary for her own security, in point of health, morals, and balance of population. It is rather a strong argument that we possess a province on the Pacific coast so contiguous to China, and that China possesses a vast population, with strong emigrating tendencies ; but we do not want our Pacific province populated by Mongolians. We want a European population, and I think we are entitled to step in and prevent the western part of the Dominion from becoming a Chinese province. I think our measure should be based on pretty much the same principles as that of our American neighbors with regard to European immigration. They do not permit immigration from all parts of Europe without recommendation. On the contrary they insist on the responsibility of the captains of vessels as to the capacity of their passengers to support themselves, and I think there are instances on record wherein the immigrants have been actually returned to Europe because they could not make it appear that they were able to support themselves in the country to which they had come. These are all practical and proper things, and if it is a fact, as I believe it is, that some of the worst classes of the Chinese have been launched wholesale upon the western coasts of America, it is reason enough why we should legislate on this point, and legislate with sufficient force to prevent those contingencies which we deprecate occurring in our western province. I think we are fairly entitled to say that before a Chinaman shall land upon our shores he shall be bound to produce to us a certificate of character, a guarantee that he is a decent man ; and we are also entitled to see to it that he imports no disease of any kind amongst us. We may find ourselves put to very great expense in police matters, and expose perhaps, more or less of our country to some danger if the allegations laid against the Chinese are true, which I do not at all, myself, undertake to assert or deny. At all events we should exercise caution in these matters, and as to whether those emigrants are in a healthy state, so as not to import any skin disease, or other disease, amongst us. But I must say that I sympathize very strongly with the remarks of other speakers against throwing obstacles in the way of importing Chinese women. I think that the Chinaman who brings his wife with him to this country should be encouraged to do so—of course he giving sufficient security that he is married to her and that she is a proper character.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman has not looked into the Chinese marriage laws or he would not make that statement.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I have not looked into them but I think at all events there is a pretty good *prima facie* case made out by the hon. gentleman from Halifax on that point. There is no necessity for throwing needless obstacles in the way of the morality of the Chinese. I have read the travels of some Europeans

in different parts of the Chinese Empire and their statements in regard to the capability of Chinese men for labor and industries, and how labor is encouraged. If we look at their course in the United States, is it not a fact that the railways and great improvements on the Pacific coast would have been absolutely impossible without Chinese labor? It is not so very long since a prejudice similar to that against the Chinese existed in the eastern states of America against the Irish, just as baseless and just as groundless. For a time the Irish were a most unpopular body in the United States, but time has reconciled the Americans and the Irish. I may say I do not altogether like the principle upon which this Bill is founded. Some of its clauses seem to me to be severe, but I think we have a right to consider our British Columbian province, and to prevent it from being overrun, in the manner that is apprehended there, by Chinese immigrants. I should look upon this as a temporary measure. I wish, myself, that it were specifically enacted for a limited time, and I think some of those severe conditions that are in it might be relaxed. Those Chinamen, for instance, upon departure from the country at a limited period should receive their bonus which they paid, provided they have not broken any of our laws, or put our country to any expense. It seems to me to be rather a crude measure; but at the same time the general principle of it, that we are to prevent one of our provinces from becoming entirely Mongolian, is a sound one.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

MANITOBA CLAIMS BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (155), "An Act for the final settlement of the claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion." He said—The position of Manitoba has been exceptional in the Dominion, and it is exceptional because of the rapid increase of population there as compared with any other province. Their position is changed from year to year in a way that the position of other provinces does not change, and therefore what is a reasonable provision with reference to other provinces, regarding the sums which they are to draw from the Dominion Treasury, is not reasonable as regards Manitoba. They have no public lands of their own, and that is another feature of the exceptional position in which they stand. The other provinces brought more or less land and other property into the Dominion, with the exception of Prince Edward Island, and to that province a certain allowance was made in lieu of land. Then following the example shown to Prince Edward Island, a certain amount was allowed to Manitoba in lieu of land, and it was found insufficient. The expenditure of the province has augmented very largely, owing to the increase of population, and the increase of the administration of justice, and it is reasonable that provision should be made to meet the exceptional position in which they stand. The provision made by this Bill is, in the first place, that they should receive a grant, completely free, of all the swamp lands in the province. Those swamp lands they will have to drain, and once drained they will prove to be very valuable. The objection has been raised to the words "swamp lands" as not being sufficiently precise. It was found in the statutes of some of the States of the neighboring Republic, and it was found that there was no difficulty in arriving at the meaning of the term there, and I think none will probably be found in this case. Swamp lands will come to mean those lands which have been drained by the money of the Province of Manitoba, and in that way we will arrive at a clear meaning of the phrase. Then it is proposed to set aside a quantity of land, 150,000 acres, for the purpose of endowing a University. That is a provision which every one will agree with. It cannot be devoted to a better purpose. The sum now payable annually to the province as an indemnity for having no public lands shall be increased from $45,000 to $100,000 from the 1st of July last. That sum with their present income, and the other resources which this Bill gives them will be money enough to provide for the ordinary wants of the community which exists in Manitoba, and it is

only increased because it was found by the experience of two or three years that their expenditure was so augmented by the rapidly increasing population, by the necessity of preserving order, and the expenditure connected with the administration of justice, that they could not go on without some revision of the terms on which they became part of the Dominion. Then to enable us to give the $100,000, the census of the country instead of being taken every ten years, as it is in the rest of the Dominion, is to be taken every five years, and in the interim an arbitrary opinion is to be arrived at as to what the population is, and the sum to be allowed is to be guided by the increasing population.

HON. MR. WARK—I am afraid that this expression "swamp lands," will lead to a great deal of difficulty and misunderstanding hereafter. I think it would have been much better to have had those lands examined and their position defined so that there would be no misunderstanding afterwards as to where they are, and what the quantity is. When I brought the question of a reserve of lands before the House, for the purpose of clearing off the debt, some hon. members misunderstood my remarks—that the lands were to be held in reserve. I should like to say that my suggestion was that they should be sold as rapidly as possible and the debt paid off with the proceeds.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentlemen proposed to set apart a certain amount of public lands in the North West, and that those public lands should form the basis of a specific fund for the purpose of paying off the amounts which the country has expended on them. That was the proposition?

HON. MR. WARK—My proposition was to sell them as rapidly as possible to pay off the debt.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—To pay off the debt incurred on behalf of that territory?

HON. MR. WARK—On behalf of the expenditure out there.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is, we should raise out of the lands which are situated in Manitoba, or out of lands situated in the North West Territories, a specific fund to be devoted to the paying of the debt incurred for Manitoba or for the North-West. The answer to that is that the proceeds of all the lands sold in that province or in the North-West Territories go into a common fund, and out of that fund the expenses are paid. Whether you pay them out of a specific appropriation of land or out of the general fund makes no difference. The hon. gentleman seems to suppose that we should take hold of something which is not now the property of the Dominion, and out of that pay those expenses.

HON. MR. WARK—No, not at all.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not propose to say anything against this Bill, but there is one feature of it to which the Minister of Justice has adverted, and also the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I think it is to be regretted that the Government have not made up their mind to put a definition of what are swamp lands, in the Bill. It is always better to take a little trouble in passing a bill, so as to prevent any misunderstanding of its meaning in the future, than to save the trouble now, and have the difficulty afterwards in deciding what the law is. I understand that opinions differ very widely as to what swamp lands are, and the Government ought to have inserted in the Bill such a description of swamp lands as would prevent disputes and difficulties arising hereafter.

HON. MR. VIDAL—Can you suggest one?

HON. MR. POWER—No, I am not familiar with the country out there; but the Department of the Interior who have charge of the lands, and the members from Manitoba ought to be able to describe them in such a way that it could be easily understood what swamp lands are. There is one other feature about this Bill that deserves mention. Canada has heretofore dealt pretty liberally with Manitoba The Government now propose to add $55,000 to the annual subsidy payable to that province.

I have no objection to that, because my impression is that as a general thing the funds of the provincial governments are administered more economically and more directly for the good of the people than the funds which are in the hands of the Dominion Government; and I am perfectly satisfied to see money going into the hands of the Government in Manitoba, by whom I presume it will be well expended; but I am aware that the Government have had before them, for some time past, claims on behalf of the province of Nova Scotia. That province has less money to expend in proportion to her population than any other province in the Dominion. Having some little knowledge of the way in which the business of the local legislature and of the Government is transacted, I know that everything is done there in the very cheapest and most economical way, and with all that, important and necessary public works have to be done without. I regret that, while dealing so liberally—I do not say more liberally than is fair—with this western province, and with other western portions of the Dominion, the Government have not seen their way to deal in the same liberal spirit with the province from which I come.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—There seems to have been a great deal of money down in Nova Scotia until such time as the Liberal party got into power, and then it was wasted in extravagance, partly by building railways and not completing them, and then handing them over to the Dominion for half what they cost. I think the less money that is given to the Nova Scotia Government to spend and waste the better.

HON. MR. POWER—That is a patriotic sentiment for a Nova Scotian.

HON. MR KAULBACH—I think the Dominion Government can spend money in Nova Scotia more wisely than the local Government can. I presume this Bill is in full of all demands?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—And I see the increase is to be limited to a population of 400,000.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. POWER—My hon. friend from Lunenburg reminds me of the saying that if you put one Irishman on a spit you can always get another Irishman to turn it.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think the hon. gentleman from Halifax is just the Irishman that can turn the spit.

HON. MR. DEVER—Have those two hon. gentlemen turned Irishmen?

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I have been trying to find the meaning of "swamp lands," and I have not been able to do so, but I assume that it is the land which at some time of the year is overflowed with water, stagnant or otherwise?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—If that is the definition for it, it is not quite so easy a matter to describe it by metes and bounds as some hon. gentlemen consider, because the edges of those swamps will be as irregular as the sea shore. For that reason it would be an exceedingly tedious and troublesome matter to describe metes and bounds in a measure like this. What I wish to call the attention of the House to is the necessity of introducing a clause into this Bill or some other Bill for arterial drainage, because those swamps cannot be approached at all. You must approach them with arterial drains, and unless you take power to go through other lands, and through private property if necessary, they cannot be drained.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That power will be given by the Local Legislature.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—I think it would be very easy to have a provision to prevent any difficulty in the matter. There must be some returns that will give an idea of the quantity of those swamp lands. Then supposing it should be put at 2,000,000 acres, with a provision that if there is not that quantity of swamp lands in the province the amount may be made up with

other lands, or something of that kind. The quantity being established it would prevent any difficulty in the future, and the Dominion Government would only be exposed to giving a few hundred or a few thousand acres of other land, which would not be a matter so much to be regretted, as any difficulty or misunderstanding as to what swamp lands are.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I do not think that this anticipated difficulty is at all likely to arise. As an old land surveyor I know that it is not such a difficult matter to say what are swamp lands and what are not. Moreover, I think in the Bill we have happily the final decision as to them provided for. These swamp lands are to be proved to be such to the satisfaction of the Dominion Government. What more is wanted? That constitutes the final appeal, and the Government decide what to accept or reject as swamp lands. In the first place it is not at all likely that the local government would make a claim on the Dominion for any other than recognized swamp land. Then the provincial government and legislature have shown their acceptance of this Bill and their willingness to abide by the decision of the Government as to what are swamp lands, and we have here in the Departmental offices very full and complete surveys with field notes on which to base such decisions; I believe that here in Ottawa without any other assistance than those maps and field notes I could sit down and tell whether any lands that have been surveyed are swamp lands or not.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Then why not fix them?

HON. MR. VIDAL—Because it would be utterly impossible to designate every lot in detail in any statute. There are considerable quantities of such land which without extensive drainage are unavailable for cultivation. The Dominion Government say that these lands are to be handed over to the Province of Manitoba, and they at their own expense will drain them, and derive a revenue from the sale of them. I do not know anything more simple or satisfactory than an arrangement of this kind, and I apprehend no difficulty between the two governments in determining and specifying the lands that are to be included under the term "swamp lands."

HON. MR. GIRARD—The present Bill should be, as we say in the preamble, a final settlement of all difficulties between the Province of Manitoba and the Dominion. But I do not know that it will be so. It seems to me that such a Bill should be well received by the Dominion Government, and I expect that it will give general satisfaction in the Province of Manitoba. Transactions with reference to land are not always satisfactory to every one. It is understood by a portion of our population in Manitoba that those public lands belong to the Province and not to the Dominion, but for my part I consider there has been such a large expenditure incurred in the surveying and development of the country, that there should be no dissatisfaction on that point. The Government have, to a certain extent, recognized the right of the Local Legislature to the possession of these lands, because on one occasion $45,000 was given to the Province in lieu of their lands, and that sum was augmented on another occasion to $100,000, with the same understanding that it was in lieu of lands. For a time this Bill will give satisfaction, I have no doubt, but I anticipate there will be renewed applications to the Dominion Government until all the public lands in the Province belong to the local authorities, and there will not be general satisfaction there until that is accomplished. These swamp lands are not a great source of wealth in a country where real estate has not a high value. I understand swamp lands to be those which are covered all the time by water. To render them fit for cultivation the local government will be obliged to make large expenditures in constructing drains and otherwise—certainly a larger amount than the present value of the lands. I am sure the grant which is made to the University of Manitoba will receive the approval of every hon. gentleman in this House. It is an exceptional institution, at which Catholics and Protestants can receive degrees and where there is every indication of prosperity and progress. It occupies quite an exceptional position in the

Dominion, and I am sure it will go on doing good work, and continue to be an example for the rest of the Dominion. Such an institution deserves aid. I am sure the lands which are granted by this Bill will enable that institution to increase the good work that it is now performing, in affording a good, sound education to the youth of the Province. I shall vote for the Bill with great pleasure.

HON. MR. WARK—I was in hopes before the hon. member for Sarnia sat down that he would tell us what are called swamp lands. I do not believe that lands which are overflowed once in a year are swamp lands, because some of the finest land we have along the Bay of Fundy and along the valleys of the rivers in the Lower Provinces are overflowed at high water, but when the water recedes it leaves them something like an irrigated meadow. What I call a swamp is land which is so flat that when the snow and ice melt the water remains upon it until it evaporates.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

The Senate adjourned at 9.15 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Tuesday, July 14th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of Bill (146), "An Act to amend the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883."

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

PACIFIC RAILWAY AID BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (153), "An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to provide for the completion and successful operation thereof." He said—This is a Bill which provides for certain assistance being given to the Canadian Pacific Railway to enable them to complete their great enterprise. The House is no doubt aware that the company now owe the public some $30,000,000. The whole of the money has not yet been paid to them, but they have got most of it, and they will get the rest of it as the work goes on, so that the company may be said to owe the country $30,000,000. For this sum the Government hold a first security on their property. It is proposed that the company shall issue a new mortgage with bonds, the bonds amounting to $35,000,000, out of which they shall pay the country $20,000,000, being a portion of this $30,000,000 that I speak of; that the remaining $15,000,000 shall be theirs to be dealt with by them. The House will see that if this is carried out the debt which is now $30,000,000, will be reduced from $30,000,000 to $10,000,000, , for that $10,000,000 the security for the country hereafter will consist in the first place of the unsold lands of the company, amounting to 21,000,000 acres, which are to be dealt with and exhausted if necessary, and should any balance remain due to the Government by the company after the lands have been exhausted, that balance shall be a second lien upon the railway itself. So that the debt due the Government, which is now $30,000,000, will be divided into two. For the $20,000,000 we shall have the security which we have now, coupled with this fact that the other $15,000,000 will be allowed to come in and rank *pari passu* with our $20,000,000, leaving a balance of $10,000,000, for which balance we shall have the security of the land, and if the lands fail we shall have a second mortgage on the railway itself. In speaking of this proposed change I desire, in the first place, to point out to the House the position which the $20,000,000 will occupy. That amount will still be, as it is now, a first claim on the railway: it will still be, as it is now, a first mortgage on the property, but we shall have allowed $15,-

000,000 to come in and rank with it. Those $15,000,000, however, will be expended on the railway itself, so that the property will be increased in value by the expenditure of $15,000,000 and although we admit the $15,000,000 to rank with our $20,000,000, we shall have thereafter a better security for the $20,000,000 than we have now, although it now stands as a first lien. That, I think, is the position which the $20,000,000 will occupy. It has been urged that we are weakening our security to the extent of allowing the other $15,000,000 to come in and rank with us. It does not seem to be a just argument, inasmuch as the $15,000,000 to be raised is to be expended on the railway itself, increasing its value, and therefore augmenting the value of the security to the extent of the expenditure. Then, as to the $10,000,000, we certainly are taking that out of the position of a first lien and ranking it solely upon the land, in the first instance, with a provision that if the land should be exhausted, then we shall have a second mortgage on the railway itself; but the land which is given as security amounts to something like 21,000,000 acres. I take it there is no danger, or very little danger, that that land will be exhausted without paying the $20,000,000 but if, by any peradventure, that should be the case, we shall have a second mortgage on the railway itself, and by the change we shall have opened the door for the railway to provide for itself out of its own resources the $15,000,000 for carrying on the works of the company. The Bill does not propose any assistance to the company in the way of a permanent loan, or giving an increased price in any way, but it proposes to open the door so that they may themselves borrow on their own security this $15,000,000. That is the first *prima facie* view of the transaction which the House is now asked to sanction.

The second is this: that out of the $35,000,000 of these bonds which are to be issued in pursuance of the mortgage which this Bill is to make legal, and out of the $15,000,000 which are given to them out of the $35,000,000, the company are to lodge with the Government $8,000,000 and upon lodging with us $8,000,000 bonds, we advance them temporarily, up to the 1st of July next, the sum of $5,000,000. It will be a temporary loan for which there is most ample reason to believe full security will be put up. The only doubt which anybody could possibly throw upon that expectation would be drawn from the fact that the issue of that portion of the $35,000,000 to the public which is to be placed in the market—that is the $15,000,000—may possibly not be taken up. I do not think that it is an appreciable risk. I have no doubt—and I have strong reason for expressing that opinion—that the $15,000,000 of bonds which are to be offered to the public will be taken up, and the first appropriation of any part of the $15,000,000 will be to reimburse the Government the $5,000,000 they are advancing. That will be done for a double reason. In the first place, the company will be naturally anxious to redeem their undertaking to pay us by the time mentioned, the 1st of July, 1886, and, in the second place, that they are depositing with us $8,000,000 of bonds to secure to us the repayment of the five millions on the 1st of July next year. I do not, therefore, feel any doubt that that money will be repaid. Should my expectations be realized, then after the 1st of July, 1886, the company will be in full possession of its $15,000,000 of bonds; they may have sold them, but in that case the proceeds will have passed into the hands of the Government, to be expended for the purpose of strengthening the security, and the Government will be in possession of its twenty million acres of land which is to be devoted to paying the balance of the debt. That is the proposal which this Bill lays down. I hope that I have made it clear to the House. One cannot be sure that he makes himself understood when speaking of figures—at least I cannot, and I feel a distrust whether I am making them as clear as I desire to make them, and whether I am succeeding in placing others in the position mentally which I feel myself in, with regard to the figures and the transactions which I am trying to describe. I hope that the House sees that our present position, the $30,000,000 will be altered; that we shall have security the same as we have now—the first security, for $20,000,000, although other $15,000,000 will rank *pari passu* with it. For the remainder we

shall have the land, with the ultimate power of resorting to the railway if the land fails, and I should add that $35,000,000 of stock is to be cancelled, reducing the capital upon which dividends are to be paid to $65,000,000. It does not seem to be a proposition very onerous to the country. It does not to me seem one that should call forth the very strong animadversion made upon it because, as I view it, it is not a very extraordinary help to give to a company embarked in so gigantic a transaction as this company is. But the objections which have been taken are numerous, and I think that perhaps it will be best that I shall endeavor to reply to some of them, even at this stage of the debate, because I hope that it may not be necessary for me to speak again, and because I think the explanation which I shall give now will perhaps assist hon. gentlemen to understand fully the position of the matter as it is presented to the House, and to consider the weight which they may think is due to the objections which have been raised. I state those objections on my own authority, having read the debates elsewhere, and having followed in a general way the newspaper discussions on the subject. I may not state them all, but I intend to state them all, and believe that I shall do so. The first objection taken is that the company has not spent its money on the Pacific Railway proper; that is, that they have misappropriated their money, not to speak offensively—that they have not spent it on the work which the country entrusted to them to perform, and that, therefore, they are not entitled to any further consideration on the part of Parliament. Those taking that objection say "Show us fully all the money that you have spent from the Government on the line of railway, and we will show you that that money would have completed it, equipped it, and started the running of it." I think there are two modes of answering that objection, either of which seems to be complete. The first answer I propose to give is this, that the whole of the money which the railway company has ever got from the Government, from the beginning to now, has always been obtained upon an engineer's certificate.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The form of the engineer's certificate I have with me, and it certifies that so much work has been done; that so much remains to be done, and that the proportion which has been done is so and so to the proportion which remains to be done. I think that the House would perhaps desire to see the exact *modus operandi*, and it may be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen to see the kind of certificate which was required by the Government before any money was paid; and I have taken from the copies of the minutes of the Privy Council the last certificate or last memorandum of Council upon which the certificate was issued. This Order-in-Council is on a memorandum dated 9th July, 1885, and is as follows:

Certified Copy of a Report of a Committee of the Honorable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the 9th July, 1885.

On a Memorandum dated 9th July, 1885 from the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals, submitting a certificate, No 47, dated 7th July, instant, from the Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway with respect to the Eastern Station of the road, of which the following are the details:

Total value of work done and material delivered up to the 1st of July, 1885	$19,551,797
West of Callander 100 miles	
East of Port Arthur 67 "	
167@$15,584.61=$2,569,229	
Proportion of value of work done under the Act of 1884 to that of work remaining to be done	16,982,568
That of this amount the books of the Department show that there has already been paid the sum of	19,497,039
Leaving the balance now payable	$54,758

Of which balance the portions chargeable to the "Loan" and "Subsidy" accounts severally are as follows.

Loan	$31,700
Subsidy	23,058
	$54,758

The Minister recommends that authority be given for the payment to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the said balance of $54,758 accordingly.

The Committee advise that authority be given as recommended.

Now, that has been the course pursued by the Government uniformly throughout, and the company has drawn no money from the country except on a certificate of that kind, with the single exception of the seven and a half millions advanced them under the loan of last session for the purpose of paying off their floating debt.

Parliament was pleased to authorize the payment of that sum of money for the purpose of paying off the floating debt, the company satisfying the Government that that floating debt had been incurred for the purpose of the railway, and this was the language used on that occasion by Parliament :—

"The Government may, out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, make a loan to the said company of any amount in money, not exceeding $22,500,000 to be repaid to the Government on or before the first day of May, 1891, with interest at the rate of five per centum, payable half yearly until full payment of the principal; and out of the said loan the Government may advance to the company forthwith such amount, not exceeding $7,500,000, as shall be required by the company to extinguish its present floating debt, the amount and character of the items of such debt to be established to the satisfaction of the Government."

The Government asked for information In accordance with the language I have read. They asked for information as to the amount and character of the items of these seven and a half millions. The company gave the character and items of their floating debt, which amounted to $8,144,000. I leave out the hundreds for the sake of convenience, and it was thus composed :—

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Overdraft at Bank of Montreal (see certificate of Bank attached) Mainly for supplies and labor furnished north of Lake Superior	$3,494,280 55
Loans for purposes of Company:	
Demand loan, Bank of Montreal, N.Y., interest added.	814,271 54
Demand loan, C. Unger & Co., N. Y., interest added..	2,521,666 66
Loan due March 13th, F. W. Gilley & Co., N. Y., interest added	404,000 00
Demand loan, G. S. Scott & Co., interest added.....	402,000 00
Demand loan, J. Kennedy Tod & Co., interest added..	402,000 00
1883 accounts unpaid,.....	75,918 76
	$8,114,137 51

I, Isaac G. Ogden, of the city of Montreal, auditor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, do solemnly declare that the foregoing is a correct statement of indebtedness of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that the said Company have received a full cash equivalent for the same, which has been used for material, supplies and labor furnished on the line of the said Company's railway and for other purposes of the Company in connection therewith.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty's reign intituled "An Act for the Suppression of Voluntary and extra Judicial Oaths."

(Signed,) ISAAC G. OGDEN.

Solemnly declared before me at the city of Montreal this 26th day of February, 1884, in pursuance of the said Act.

(Signed,) R. T. HENEKER,
Commissioner for receiving affidavits for the Province of Quebec.

That we did not consider thoroughly satisfactory, and we asked for further information from the Accountant, and this additional paper was sent in :—

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

I, Isaac G. Ogden, of the City of Montreal, Auditor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, do solemnly declare :—

That the statement of floating debt of the the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, being sum of $8,114,137.51 declared by me on the twenty-sixth day of February, 1884, to be a correct statement of indebtedness of said Company is composed of indebtedness accrued from the amount deposited with the Government on account of guarantee of dividend, to wit. the sum of $3,781,797.49; and that the balance to wit. the sum of $4,332,340.02 accrued on account of expenditure on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, west of Callander, and is still due.

And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled "An Act for the suppression of Voluntary and extra-Judicial Oaths."

Signed,

ISAAC G. OGDEN.

Solemnly declared before me at the City of Montreal, this sixth day of March, 1884, under and by virtue of the said Act.

Signed,

R. T. HENEKER,
Commissioner for taking affidavits for the Province of Quebec.

There, hon gentlemen, is an account which I think is satisfactory and complete, as far as anything of that kind can be, of the mode in which the seven and a-half million of dollars was expended. Now if it be true that every dollar of the money which the company ever got from the

Government was composed either of money paid under a certificate, such as I have read, from the engineer, and an Order-in-Council passed on that certificate—if it be true that no money was paid to them except under a certificate, save this seven and a-half million of dollars, and if the House is satisfied with the statement of Mr. Odgen, the accountant, as to the mode of the expenditure of that seven and a-half million of dollars, then it is established as clearly as anything can be established, that the company has not diverted the money from the purposes of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It has not diverted the money which the country gave it. The country gave the company a large sum of money for these purposes, and it is perfectly proper that they should be called upon to establish to the satisfaction of Parliament that they have expended all the money which they got from the country for the purpose which the country had in view when they appropriated it for the company. I think that is established clearly by the proof which I have offered to the House of the mode in which they obtained money—the only mode in which they obtained it. But there is another way to establish it, and I have, with a view to make it certain, taken that other plan also. It is to show exactly what money they have spent in works of construction, and where it has gone. The question comes, in the first place, what is the main line, and what is its extent? Are they to go beyond the terminal points mentioned in the original bill? The only question is upon the terminal point at Callander station. The House will keep in mind that they were to construct a railway from Callander station to Port Moody, and *operate* it—they were to maintain and run it, and they were authorized by the Bill to establish connections with Montreal and Brockville. I take it—where you ask a company to *operate* such a railway that everyone, who thinks at all about it, will admit that it could not have been intended that the road was to begin at Callander—that there must be connection with Montreal. You cannot begin a road in the middle of the woods and *operate* it from there; although I separate the sections afterwards into that West of Callander and that East of Callander, so that the House may see the separate view of it as well as the view which I myself take, yet, I think, for the purpose of my argument it is just and proper to say that the road begins at Montreal, because the contract which they made with the country, rendered it absolutely necessary that they should run down to Montreal. It was impossible, and no business man would dream of commencing to *operate* the road from Callander, and it was a consequence which was unavoidable, and foreseen and mentioned, and which may, therefore, be fairly considered, and the eastern section is, in fact, by the terms of the charter, made part of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I will give the figures. Hon. gentlemen may desire to verify them. I have verified them myself by going over them with Mr. Miall, who was the accountant sent by the Government to Montreal for the purpose of inspecting the company's books and who had the most ample opportunity of examining the books. I will read to the House his figures, the correctness of which I have no doubt of whatever. They are as follows:

COST OF MAIN LINE.

WEST OF CALLANDER.

Construction of main line	$43,776,912
Improvements on Government sections	1,241,780
Materials on hand there	3,687,729
	$48,706,421

The House knows of course that the company got the works which the Government had constructed between Port Arthur and Red River and these works, at the time they were handed over, had been used for some time for contractors' purposes and were not in very good repair. They put them in good order, and expended on those sections to do so $1,200,000. Then, of course, there was the equipment. That is a very expensive part of operating the railway, and some doubt, I know, has been felt by those who have taken a keen interest in this matter, whether the equipment which is charged in the accounts was all for the Canadian Pacific Railway, or whether part of it was not for other railways in which the same persons are mixed up; as for instance, the Ontario and Quebec, and the Credit Valley and others. That was a point upon which the most careful enquiry was made by Mr. Miall, and by Mr. Schreiber, the Government

engineer, and the figures which I have given as the cost of equipment, are confined absolutely to the equipment of the main line. I divide them in two, so that the House may see how much of this equipment is chargeable to the railway west of Callander, and how much is properly chargeable to the railway east of Callander. The figures are as follows:

Equipment of entire main line	9,168,755	
Proportion at a mileage rate East of Callander, 350 to 2,950 miles, say 7·59, 52·59 for portion West of Callander	1,087,801	8,080,954
Interest and financial expenses and on entire main line 52·59th of total	1,389,474	
Proportion East of Callander	164,853	
		1,224,621
Expended under contract		$58,011,996

East of Callander they did not build a road; they acquired existing roads; they acquired the Canada Central Railway running from this city via Carleton Place to Callander, and they acquired the Brockville & Ottawa.

EAST OF CALLANDER.

Acquisition of main line	$4,213,758	
Proportion of equipment 7/59	1,087,801	
Proportion of expenses 7/59	164,853	
		5,466,412
Total cost of entire main line		$63,478,408
BRANCHES—		
Algoma branch; branches at Winnipeg		4,605,172
CONNECTIONS—		
S. E. Ry., Manitoba S. W., St. L. & O., Atlantic & N. W. &c		5,857,224
Dividends		5,378,000
Deposit as security for dividend		6,907,377
Total expenditure		$86,226,181

Gentlemen may quarrel with the items for connections and dividends, and with the item deposited as security, but these are the absolute expenditures of the company, and it is necessary that they should be recorded in order to show where the company's money went, and satisfy the House that as far as the public money went it was expended upon the main line from Montreal to Port Moody.

This total expenditure, $86,226,000, was provided in this way:

Government subsidy	$20,240,317	
Proceeds of land	8,702,086	
Town sites	504,675	
Total aid from Govt	$29,447,078	
Government loan	18,626,600	
		48,073,678
		$38,152,503
Amount provided by Company from these sources:		
Capital stock	$29,568,123	
Bonuses	232,600	
Earnings (nett)	1,456,318	
Floating debt	6,895,462	
		$38,152,503

People are disposed, and I have been too apt myself in the past, to confound the loan and the subsidy together. I do not think we should in any way grudge this company the subsidy. It is part of their contract. We speak of it as though they were indebted to the country for the subsidy as well as the loan. For the loan they are indebted to the country. That was a matter of grace and favor, but the subsidy is theirs: they earned it and have given value for it, and it is as much theirs as the price of a house would be if they had built it under contract. The following is a resumé of the figures I have given:

The Company expended on the main line west of Callander		$48,706,421
It received subsidies		29,447,078
Surplus above subsidies		$19,259,343
It received as a loan from the Government, for which it has given security		$18,626,600
Expended on contract portion above both loan and subsidies		$ 632,743
The Company expended on the main line proper, Montreal, to the Pacific		$58,011,996
It received from the Government subsidies	$29,447,078	
Government loan secured	$18,626,600	$48,073,678
Surplus provided by the Co. on entire main line		$9,938,318

In the face of the statements which I have submitted it seems to me clear that no one can justly or truly say that the company have not expended on the main line, between Montreal and Port Moody, all the money which they received from the Government. They have expended all of that and more too, and it seems to me that is the point with which we have to deal. I do not think we have the same right to criticize the course which they pursue with reference to their stock. It was their own, and they raised money on it and expended it partly on the main line and

partly for extending their line to the seaboard, but that is a transaction which they had a right to enter into. All we can properly ask of them is to demonstrate that the money which we gave them has been spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway and to finish that work, and that I submit to the House, with great confidence, has been shown by both the modes which I have adopted, the one by showing that they got no money from us, except by certificate, with the exception of $7,500,000, and shown that that sum was spent on the main line, and the other by showing exactly what the cost of construction has been, and that it has exceeded considerably the amount they got from the country. So in both ways I think it is established that the company has kept faith with the country, and that it has expended all the money it got from us by subsidy or loan on the road itself.

Another argument which is made use of is that the company have not kept faith with the country in the character of the work which they have done on the road, and particularly as regards curves and gradients. Now, with reference to the character of the work, everyone who has gone over it speaks in strong terms of its character. Some of my hon. friends in this House have gone over it—I know the hon. member from Amherst has—and I have heard the Minister of Public Works and others, and I think I am right and justified in saying that the consensus of opinion of those who have gone over the road—those who are skilled and those who are not—is that the road has been well built and is an excellent road, a better road than the one which was taken as a pattern; a road which in all respects commends itself to engineers as a better road than any which crosses the continent, and a road which any engineer would pronounce as a first-class road. As regards the particular objection as to grades and curves, I will read to the House a very admirable and clear statement made by Mr. Van Horne, the vice-president of the road, which establishes to my mind that the road which has been constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. is a better line than the one which was taken as a pattern for it—that is the Union Pacific. I cannot possibly put the argument in clearer terms than it is stated by Mr. Van Horne. He says:—

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY,
MONTREAL, 19th June, 1885.

The contract between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company provides that the Union Pacific Railway shall be taken as an "approximate standard," whereby the quality and character of the railway, and of the materials used in construction thereof, and of the equipment thereof may be regulated;" and this clause was interpreted by a subsequent letter as meaning the Union Pacific Railway as it was when accepted by the United States Government in 1873.

It is claimed by the parties to the contract on the part of the Company that in referring to the Union Pacific Railway, they, and the Government as well, had in mind the entire line between Omaha and San Francisco—the entire line being commonly known in Canada and the east as the Union Pacific, and the technical difference between the sections east and west of Ogden being little understood by the public.

However this may have been, the clause in the contract fixing the standard has always been understood by the company as referring to the general character of the railway in respect of gradients, curvature, track, bridges, rolling stock and appurtenances, but not as providing that the maximum grades or curves should in no cases, and under no circumstances exceed the maximum of the Union Pacific, and the Company confidently assert that in all respects the Canadian Pacific is superior to the standard named, *and particularly in the matter of gradients.*

While it is no doubt true that the maximum gradients on the Union Pacific Railway at the present time do not exceed 90 feet to the mile, it is also true that gradients of 116 feet to the mile were used in the original construction of that railway, and that curves of 10 degrees or more were also used.

To what extent these had been reduced in 1873, I have no data at hand to show, but for this comparison we are willing to take the Union Pacific as it exists to-day.

That railway from Omaha to Cheyenne, 515 miles, has light gradients, corresponding to those on our line for 957 miles west of Winnipeg. From Cheyenne to Ogden, the remaining 517 miles of the Union Pacific, or 50 per cent. of its entire length, gradients of 90 feet per mile are scattered throughout.

On that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway constructed by the Company, the maximum permanent gradient from Callander to Port Arthur, 653 miles, and for 957 miles west from Winnipeg, is $52\frac{8}{10}$ feet to the mile. Then comes a section of 120 miles, with several permanent gradients of 116 feet to the mile; beyond this a section of 113 miles, with several gradients of 66 feet, and finally 65 miles, with the minimum gradients $52\frac{8}{10}$ feet to the mile.

The maximum grade section on the Canadian Pacific is therefore embraced within a distance equal to only 6 per cent. of the main line built by the company, while the maximum grade section of the Union Pacific covers 50 per cent. of its entire distance. And even if the Canadian Pacific maximum grade section is made to include the section embracing the 66 feet grades, or all above $52\frac{8}{10}$ feet to the mile, it will amount to only 12 per cent. of the main line built by the Company.

Assuming that double the power is required to move a given load over a grade of 116 feet that is required over a grade of 90 feet (and the difference is not nearly so great), it will readily be seen that the advantage is largely in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, by reason of its concentration of grades on a short section, and that a given average expenditure of power per mile of railway will move a much greater load over the entire length of the Canadian Pacific Railway than over the Union Pacific; and even if we take for the purpose of comparison a section of the Canadian Pacific extending eastwards from Savona's Ferry 1,032 miles (the Union Pacific distance) and including the heavy grade section, the comparison will still be largely in favor of the Canadian Pacific, whose maximum grade section would be 12 per cent. of the 1032 miles, and the section embracing grades exceeding $52\frac{8}{10}$ feet to the mile less than 24 per cent.; and although such a comparison would be decidedly unfair to the Canadian Pacific, it is clear that the same average expenditure of power would move more tons over this section than over the entire length of the Union Pacific.

A freight train starting from Montreal for the Pacific on the Canadian Pacific Railway will require assistance ascending but one grade, namely, that of the east slope of the Selkirks, and a freight train starting from the Pacific terminus for Montreal will require assistance in only two places; namely, the ascent of the west slope of the Selkirks, and the west slope of the Rocky Mountains; and the two grades coming eastwards are in the direction of the lightest trans-continental traffic.

The line over which the same expenditure of power will move the greatest tonnage is surely the superior line in respect of gradients, and this is governed not so much by the maximum gradients as by their distribution.

A line 100 miles in length with a single gradient of say 150 feet to the mile for five miles is far superior to a line of 100 miles with gradients of fifty feet to the mile, aggregating five miles in length, but scattered along at intervals. In the latter case an average locomotive could haul but twenty loaded cars over the entire line, while on the line with the single heavy grade an average locomotive could haul fifty cars over ninety-five miles of its length, but would require locomotive assistance up the heavy grade of five miles, and even if this assistance should be equivalent to the use of a locomotive for 100 miles on a level line, the advantage of the line with the single heavy grade is obvious, notwithstanding its maximum gradient is three times as great, and no engineer will deny that it is infinitely superior in the matter of gradients to the line with light but scattered grades. This is an extreme case, but it will serve to illustrate the theory upon which the company has proceeded—theory which is stated by an eminent engineer, Mr. Hermann Haupt, in the following words:—

"If the maximum resistances can be concentrated at one point, and overcome at once with the aid of assistant engines, while lighter gradients in favor of the direction of the tonnage prevail on all the rest of the route, the line will be operated cheaply; but if the maximum resistances are scattered over the whole line at intervals more or less remote, the operation will be expensive." And this theory is clearly demonstrated by Mr. Arthur Wellington, C. E., in his treatise "On the economical Theory of the Location of Railways," and is sustained by every modern railway engineer of any standing.

There can be no question as to the practicability of grades of 116 feet to the mile. Such grades may be found on the Baltimore and Ohio and other important American lines carrying a heavy traffic, and the Central Pacific, the most profitable of all the Pacific railways, has many such, combined with curvature up to 12 degrees; and there is no line between the Atlantic and the Pacific on which grades of 116 feet and upwards and curves of 10 degrees and upwards do not occur.

With reference to curvature, I beg to say curves of 10 degrees only occur on the Canadian Pacific between the summit of the Rocky Mountains and the foot of the west slope of the Selkirks, all being embraced within a distance of 115 miles, except for a short distance at Kamloops Lake, and wherever curves and grades occur together, the latter are equated to the curvature. On all the rest of the line built by the Company, the curvature is very easy and it will compare favorably in this respect with any long line on this continent.

Curves of 10 degrees and upwards are not uncommon on some of the very best American Railways. They may be found on such lines as the Pennsylvania, and the Baltimore and Ohio lines running the very fastest trains and carrying the heaviest tonnage of any on this Continent.

In considering the general character of the Canadian Pacific Railway as compared with the Union Pacific, it should be remembered that the former is laid with steel rails throughout, rails weighing 56, 60 and 70 pounds to the yard, while the Union Pacific was laid with 50 pound iron rails.

The embankments of the Canadian Pacific have not in any case been made less than 14 feet in width at formation level, and the earth cuttings 22 feet, while on the Union Pacific they were 12 and 20 feet respectively.

The rock cuttings of the Canadian Pacific

are 22 feet wide, while those on the Union Pacific in 1873 were, and are yet, to a large extent, only 16 feet. The structures of all kinds on the Canadian Pacific are far superior to those on the Union Pacific. Not one iron bridge was used in the original construction of the Union Pacific, and I can state from my personal knowledge that not more than one had been built on that line up to July, 1874.

In a letter from the United States Commissioner of Railways, it is stated that more than three-fourths of the whole length of truss bridging on the Union Pacific is constructed of iron of excellent design, &c. On the Canadian Pacific every truss bridge between Montreal and the summit of the Rocky Mountains is of iron or steel, except on the section built by the Government between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg, and the iron bridges built by the Company are at least 50 per cent. heavier than are those of corresponding spans on the Union Pacific, and I do not hesitate to assert from the knowledge I have of the Union Pacific, that there is more first class bridge masonry on the two hundred miles of the Canadian Pacific between Port Arthur and the Pic River, than on the entire line of the Union Pacific.

(Sgd.) W. C. VAN HORNE,
Vice-President.

Now, I think although that comes from an officer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there is a tone of certainty and truthfulness about it that impress themselves upon the mind, and I have no doubt the statements there are correct, and I say and know that they corroborate the opinions of those who have traversed the line, and I am confident I can say with great accuracy and truthfulness that the road is superior to the line which was taken as a model—the Union Pacific—that we have got a better road than the Union Pacific by many degrees, and where fault is found with the grades and curves of the Canadian Pacific Railway, those who find fault do so without appreciating the argument I now produce to the House that the difference between two roads where the curves are scattered through the entire length, or a considerable portion of the length, and a road where the line runs straight for the best part of the whole length, with easy grades, and the curves and the heavy grades are all concentrated within a small percentage of the road at one end—the second road is better for many reasons than the first—better for the reasons given by Mr. Van Horne, because it is capable of being more economically worked and enables the company to earn more and pay better dividends.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—Has my hon. friend's attention been directed to the fact that Sir Henry Tyler, the President of the rival Grand Trunk Railway Company, has given his opinion as to the character of the road, expressing it in the very highest terms? I notice that that has been the case since his return from the Rocky Mountains.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—I had not noticed it, and I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for adding that to the evidence that I have submitted to the House as to the character of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was the second objection—which I gathered from the discussions elsewhere, and from the papers—taken to the proposal which is now before the House. Another objection which is taken is that the Syndicate has made enormous gain on the stock transactions; that they have made such an arrangement that they have got the money deposited with the Government for the purpose of paying dividends for years to come; that they have taken large amounts of stock at a very small price themselves, and that the dividends which they have thus secured afford an enormous return for the money invested. I was sorry to see when that was being dealt with in another place the comparison, as it seems to me, was not made in a fair spirit, the whole of the facts were not brought out. The amount of stock which the syndicate have acquired in this road, we all know, has cost them $10,000,000. For the first $5,000,000 they paid par; the other $20,000,000 stock they bought at 25 per cent. The whole cost of the $25,000,000 stock is $10,000,000.

Hon. Mr. WARK—Amounting to 40 cts. on the dollar.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—Forty cts. on the dollar. That is what the stock cost them altogether. Now, in the comparison elsewhere the second item only is taken into consideration, and it has been pointed out that they have been making 12 per cent on their money because they

got $20,000,000 at 25 cts. on the dollar. That is true, but nothing is said about the other $5,000,000 for which they paid par, and it seems to me a very unfair mode of presenting the question for consideration. It is true that if you confine yourself simply to the stock for which they paid 25 cts. on the dollar the dividends will give them 12 per cent., but if you add the $5,000,000 for which they paid par they would not get 12, but 7⅓ per cent. It seems to me a spirit of fairness would have induced one to have laid it before the public in its full light, so that a fair estimate might have been formed of the result of the whole transaction, and not to have chosen one particular portion of their transactions, and then to have said that on the money they had invested they got twelve per cent. They have had seven per cent. upon the money—7 per cent because the whole $25,000,000 cost them $10,000,000, and because the dividend which they have received amounted to only 7 per cent. and a fraction upon that. Why should they not get 7 per cent.? Surely no person familiar with transactions of a similar kind would grudge for a moment that in an enterprise of this enormous risk the company should get 7 per cent. on their money?

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Could the hon. gentleman say whether the latter part of the stock that was taken at 25 cents on the dollar was on the market, and how long, and what amount has been offered, and if there were any offers on the part of the public to take it?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not know that there were offers on the part of the public to take that $20,000,000, I have not heard anything of it; but we all know this, that this stock taken together cost them 40 cents. They have bought some since, which the hon. gentleman from Niagara says has cost them 42 cents. We know this, however, that any person who has desired to get stock in the road up to within the last day or two could have got it at 42 cents.

HON. MR. PLUMB—And at one time they might have had it at 34 or 35 cents.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Nothing has been obtained by the company which the whole world could not have got, and why should there be that jealousy of the company getting that which anybody else could have got if they had chosen to go into the market for it? Why should they be abused for buying at 40 cents in the dollar that which you, or I, or anybody else could go into the market and buy on the same terms? The effect of such statements is to prejudice the company in a way that they ought not to be exposed to. Then after pointing out the enormous gains which the company had made out of this contract, and as to which, as I explained to the House, the assertion is made "you have got a large sum deposited at your credit for the purpose of paying interest, why not take that and finish the road without coming to Parliament for more money?" That was the suggestion used, and which was put in the shape of a resolution in the other House as follows:—

"Canada, in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, gave the company vast aids, which were declared to be ample and final; Canada, in 1884, gave the company great additional aids, which were again declared to be ample and final; the shareholders of the company have already divided among themselves about $7,000,000 in dividends, and have on deposit with the Government about $14,000,000 more, to provide future dividends for themselves for over eight years to come, while they affirm that the railway will be profitable from the day of its opening; in the opinion of this House, the shareholders, if they desire more money for their operations, should propose to utilize their deposit for future dividends instead of asking Canada to impair its existing securities to make large further advances, and to allow the enterprise to be charged with $15,000,000 additional capital, the interest upon which must be borne by the trade of this country."

There is a proposition which I am amazed to see presented to parliament. It is a proposition to break faith with the persons to whom this $14,000,000 is pledged, not only by the faith of the country but by a contract of the most formal kind—a contract not only between the parties concerned and the Government alone, but in which a third party comes in—the Bank of Montreal. Now whom are we dealing with? We are not dealing with two or three people. We are not dealing merely with the com-

pany in this respect; but we are dealing with the immense body of shareholders who hold the stock of the company—persons living in parts of this continent, in parts of England and Scotland, and in many parts of the continent—Germany and France. I have not counted the number of names, but I hold in my hand a list of the stockholders showing their names and amounts.

HON. MR. READ—They number 1200 persons.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have the list of shareholders here at length.

HON. MR. POWER—Does the list show how much each shareholder holds?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes. The aggregate is that in England $40,000,000 of this stock is held; in the United States $10,000,000, and in Canada $15,000,000. Here is the faith of the country, not only the moral faith of the country, but the written obligation, signed and sealed, of the country and the Bank of Montreal to those people living all over the world to pay them their interest at the rate mentioned, 3 per cent.—a solemn contract binding not only in honor but in law, and yet this resolution which is proposed elsewhere suggests that this money which is deposited for the purpose of carrying out this obligation should be used for the purpose of finishing the railway. If that suggestion were carried out where would the faith and honor of the country be? That is the second objection. Now the third objection I alluded to for a moment in my earlier remarks was that we were weakening our security; that we now stand with a security which is first and alone for the $30,000,000; and by the change which the Bill proposes we are agreeing to stand first with only part of our debt, that is, with $20,000,000, and that therefore we are weakening our security. I do not think so. If the $15,000,000 which we are admitting *pari passu* to come in with us were not to be expended on the road; if it were to be expended elsewhere, and put into some other investment, then it would be true that we are weakening our security; but if those $15,000,000 are to be expended as this Bill provides, on the railway, in improving the railway itself, then I say we do not weaken our security, but on the contrary we are strengthening our security by making it more valuable than it was before. We are not weakening it but adding to it by the $15,000,000, although we are diminishing our claim upon it by $10,000,000. Then as to the $10,000,000 we have the security of the land, and I do not think we are weakening that security in a way that could be objected to. The House will bear in mind that it is necessary to give some relief to this company. We do not want to stop now when we are within a few months of the completion of a gigantic enterprise of this kind, in which Canada is so much interested, and which promises a future of such grandeur to the country; and the question now is, how are we to give this assistance? Will anybody point out a better way of doing it? Can anybody point out any other mode of giving security which is better than this, or presents more advantageous features than this one? I do not know of any. Under this system we make no further advance of money except this loan of $5,000,000. There is no giving any additional sum. We do not propose to pay them anything more for the road than we agreed originally, and for the loan we take security. Can there be any doubt as to the security for the $5,000,000, when we have $8,000,000 of bonds, $35,000,000 secured on 3,300 miles of railway now doing very well, and holding forth the strongest promise of doing better in the future? Even taking it at the mileage rate it is only $10,000 a mile, and everbody knows that is not a large sum to pledge a railway to pay, and looking at the prospect of this railway, I think any doubt on the subject will vanish. The prospects of the road, I think, are exceedingly good. If the House will bear with me a moment I will point out what have been the transactions of the company during the past year. In 1883, the earnings of the road were $5,423,000, and their expenses were $4,862,000, showing a net gain of $561,000. In 1884, their earnings were $5,750,000, and their expenses were $4,558,000, showing a net gain of $1,191,000 in round numbers

There was a step in one year of from half a million to $1,191,000. Now, we have a return, as it happens, of the earnings of the road for the first six months of the present year. As I have said, the gross earnings in 1884 were $5,750,000; the gross earnings between the first of January and the 30th June of the present yearwere $3,317,965. The gross earnings during the same period of last year were $2,098,000, showing an increase for the first six months of this year over the same period of last year of $1,219,920, or say about 60 per cent. of an increase.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Some part of that was for the transport of military stores and men.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It was; and although that was a source of profit, there is no reason to apprehend that there will not be other sources of profit in the future as there will be immigrants to carry, as numerous and as profitable as the transport of the soldiers and military stores this year. I do not know either whether the whole of the traffic for even those purposes has gone into these accounts, because a considerable portion of that earning is held over by the Government. However, it may have all gone in, but if all the earnings have gone in from that source, I do not think we should lay too much stress upon it. I am quite willing to attach a certain amount of importance to it, but not too much, because I think there is every reason to expect that business as profitable and of a more pleasant description, and more useful to the country, will follow in other years.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B. C.)—Does that return show what portions of the road gave that revenue?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, it is over the whole road. This sixty per cent. of an increase in the earnings during the last six months over the previous year if continued through the year, added to the gross earnings of 1884, would make the gross earnings for 1885, $9,200,000. Taking the working expenses at seventy per cent., and the statements of this year show that they are running the road for 70 per cent of its earnings, the net gain during this year will be $2,700,000. If I am right there, and seeing the strides that this road has made since 1883, if they go on in the same ratio as they have done up to now, the road is likely to be a very profitable investment.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Do I understand my hon. friend to say that the traffic receipts he has mentioned were for the line and its branches, or merely for the main line?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—From the whole system. It is taken from accounts published in the newspapers. From this statement it will be seen that there is no reasonable doubt that the security for the $35,000,000 is good and ample, and we run no risk whatever in advancing the company $5,000,000 on $8,000,000 of the bonds. It is certain that it will be repaid to us on the 1st of July next, and we will have rendered assistance to an enterprise which deserves our assistance and with which the interests and future of the country are deeply involved. We shall have rendered that assistance in the best possible way, with the least possible risk, and with the smallest expenditure of money. Now, supposing everything goes to the worst—and there are prophets of evil who always look at things in that light—supposing everything goes as they prophesy, and we are obliged to take the road, or it has to be dealt with for the purpose of realizing upon it the amount of obligations that has been incurred; where would we stand then? We stand with a complete and perfect security on a road of 3,300 miles at $10,000 a mile only, and yielding such returns as I speak of, and with the prospect of a future such as one would anticipate from the figures I have given. Supposing the whole cost of the road is $100,000,000, and that the revenue does not advance even so rapidly as I have pointed out in that statement, but that we have a revenue from it of $2,400,000, there would then be an annual deficit of $1,600,000, and we should be obliged to pay it. What should we have gained? We should have gained for a deficit of $1,600,000 this great railway extend-

ing from ocean to ocean; we should have done a great deal towards settling up the North-West; we should have begun building up the country in a way that I do not think any other nation ever was built up, and we should have a strong probability of there flowing into our North-West Territories a very large population. supposing that the population went in there at the rate of 50,000 persons per annum—it is not a very large calculation—supposing there were 50,000 persons went in there every year for five years, we should have at the end of that time a population of 250,000 in the North-West. Statistics show that every person in that country pays at the rate of $6 a head for taxation on customs and excise alone. At the end of five years we should have 250,000 people in there paying $6 a head for taxation, so that if you take it in that light you not only run no risk, but are certain not to lose. Ultimately if that population goes in you will have a gain, even if you have a large deficit in the running of the railway, a deficit which I have, for the purpose of this argument, put at $1,600,000 per annum. But you will have 250,000 of a population, and you will gain more by way of revenue than you have lost by having to make up that deficit in the running of the railway. However, the more likely result is that the road will pay. Why should we doubt, if it pays so well in its incipient stage, as more grain is produced in the west, and as more lumber is wanted, and all the animation and business and life of a new country increases—why should we doubt or mistrust that this road will pay? I think the probabilities are that the road will pay handsomely, but if it does not pay the interest on its cost, what would be the loss to the country then?

HON. MR. POWER—How about the loan?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The loan will be repaid if the enterprise is a success, which I hope and believe it will be. But I am supposing now that the road is not a success, if the loan is not repaid there will be this deficit; but if it is repaid we shall have acquired the road for $55,000,000 in cash, and we shall have built up a new country which in the future may be as populous, and perhaps as powerful as Russia. Why, in the far future, should we not have a country there as powerful and as wealthy as Russia? The land is in the same latitude as Russia; the country produces about the same cereals as Russia does. Russia has now a population of 80,000,000, and exports $40,000,000 in cereals alone, and what is there to make us believe that the North West may not be as populous and wealthy, and do as much for its inhabitants as Russia, and more?

HON. MR. POWER—If it does no better than Russia it is a pretty poor thing.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am astonished at the remark of the hon. gentleman. Russia has 80,000,000 inhabitants. If we get 80,000,000 inhabitants into our North West shall we not then have done a great work for this country? Will not those who succeed us say that we were strong of purpose, resolute of heart, big enough in our ideas to take the steps which are necessary to build up a new country? I think it is as true in this as in everything, that a nerveless, hopeless arm will never build up a country.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Or decrying it either.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It requires a belief in the future of the country, and a vigor that has been shown by this Administration, to accomplish a great national object such as this.

HON. MR. POWER—The administration has shown great energy in building up a public debt anyway.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—And we have something to show for the debt, as I have endeavored to point out to the House. There is one other statement which I desire to submit to hon. gentlemen, and it is with reference to the six and a half million dollars which is now the floating debt of the company. I desire to satisfy the House how this six and a half millions of debt was incurred. A statement was prepared, which was used in the first place by Hon. Mr. Pope in the other branch of parliament, showing how

the six and a half millions is made up. This statement, in order that all may appear together, I will read to the House.

Statement showing the services which occasioned the floating debt contracted by the company in 1884, as shown by their accounts, books, &c.

	Details.	Total.
Expenditure not covered by estimates—		
Callander to Port Arthur, construction..	$ 918,917 26	
Red River to Savona's Ferry construction..	1,117,040 63	
Rolling stock.....	717,737 77	
		$2,107,695 66
Port Arthur to Winnipeg construction....		758,769 67
		$2,866,465 33
Construction of branches west of Callander.....	$ 705,772 28	
Improvements on Pembina Branch.....	130,435 80	
	$ 836,208 08	
Less bonus on South-Western Branch....	200,000 00	
		636,208 08
Lake steamers..		145,118 24
Expenditure west of Callander		$3,647,791 65
Montreal to Callander (main line).....	$ 736,368 83	
Branch east of Callander.....	72,276 26	
		808,645 09
Expenditure on works, Montreal to Port Moody.....		$4,456,436 74
Administering land grant	109,437 59	
Expenses of London office, handling stores, &c.....	230,096 63	
Fire insurance premium 3 years in advance..... .	122,763 62	
	$ 462,297 84	
Less receipts on land sales..... ...	305,569 00	
		156,728 84
		$4,613,165 58
Interest and exchange	443,761 19	
do on land grant bonds.....	100,410 95	
Deposit on guarantee fund.....	147,136 87	
		691,315 01
Expended out of company's funds on connections, &c.....		1,890,334 00
		$7,194,815 49
Less receipts from town sites, municipal bonuses, and net earnings.....		299,353 00
		$6,895,462,49

This latter amount, $6,895,000, is the floating debt which is to be paid out of the proceeds of these bonds. I have now accomplished the task which I took upon myself, and I hope I have made tolerably clear the view I have taken of the position of this company and the character of the change which the Bill proposes to make; and I think I can assure the House that that change will not diminish or lessen our security in any way, and it will accomplish great good to this country, by enabling us to finish this gigantic enterprise.

Hon. Mr. POWER—As no other hon. gentleman appears to be desirous to address the House I shall venture to say a few words on this question. I am in earnest in speaking as I do, because this is a subject to which I have devoted comparatively little attention, and I have not made any special preparation to deal with the present measure. Under these circumstances it would be presumptuous for me to undertake to follow the Minister of Justice through the carefully prepared argument which he has delivered to the House, fortified as it has been with statements from the officers of the company. I may say that I think the hon. Minister has put the case for the Government and for the company far better than that case was put in the other Chamber. I venture to say that, with all respect to the other Chamber, and I regret to say that the case for the other side is not going to be put in this Chamber as it has been put elsewhere, or as it ought to be put. The case against the company, if one may so call it, has been put in another place in such a way that not even the hon. Minister who has addressed the House is able to answer it satisfactorily. I do not propose to go into any labored argument with respect to this Bill but I wish to lay before the House some of the things which strike me as being remarkable in this measure. We have the annual report of the president of the railway. The Hon. Minister of Justice has given us extracts from that report, and he has given us other information in the same direction. The effect of the report of the president and directors of the company, and the tendency of the information which the Minister has given us is to show that the

Pacific Railway Company are in a most admirable condition. The President shows that their liabilities altogether cannot amount to more than $106,000,000, and he shows that their assets amount to more than double that.

HON. MR. PLUMB—What are they made up of?

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman has the report before him, and he can satisfy himself as to the details. That is the fact; and the president calls the attention of the stockholders and of the public to the fact that the affairs of the company are in a most flourishing condition. He says that the company's fixed liabilities amount to only $3,000,000 a year. Under these circumstances it is singular that this company, with this immense property, with their magnificent prospects, should be unable to pay the men who are doing their work for them, and that they should be obliged to come to the Government and Parliament to ask for a further advance in addition to the large advances made last year to meet those pressing demands.

HON. MR. CARVELL—It is not at all strange to anyone who understands commercial transactions.

HON. MR. POWER—My commercial transactions have not been large.

HON. MR. CARVELL—If the hon. gentleman's commercial training had been at all in keeping with his other training he would know that a man might have two dollars to one away up in the millions, and still might have to borrow money. It is done every day. His assets may be in such a position that they cannot be realized on at the moment.

HON. MR. POWER—I am quite aware that companies as well as individuals may have very large properties on paper which are not available either at the present time or at any future time. We are asked now to take the company's statement as being reliable, and the Minister of Justice as well as those who supported this measure in the other House, took the same ground, and if we are to take the statement of the President of the Company as being correct in one part we have a right to take it as being correct in the other part. That is a thing that would surprise any ordinary person, that the prospects of this Company being so good, they should be in want of funds. I know at the present time money is a drug in the market. It is very abundant, and can be got at a very low rate of interest. We know that railway companies whose properties are not very valuable can succeed in borrowing money, although just now railway property, at least Canadian railway property and United States railway property, is not a favorite investment. Under ordinary circumstances a company with a property such as this should have no difficulty in raising at least five times the amount of money which this company ask the Government to lend them, and the question naturally suggests itself, why is this powerful company with its valuable property, and with its magnificent prospects, coming again to us for help? I think that a little consideration of the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway will perhaps throw some light on that point. In the first place the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. were incorporated for the purpose of building a road from Port Moody, in British Columbia, to Callander in Ontario. The western terminus of the road was provided for in a general way in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1874. It was provided in that Statute that the western terminus should be fixed by Order-in-Council. The Order-in-Council, which has the force of law, fixed that terminus at Port Moody. Then the eastern terminus was to be at Callander. That was the portion of the line contracted for, and that was the line that the company undertook to build. I may say here just by way of parenthesis, that when we were discussing—if the House will excuse me for referring to a previous debate—an inquiry of the hon. gentleman from New Westminster (Mr. McInnes) I said that the company were now about spending $700,000 west of Port Moody. I find in the report of the President for the last year that they estimate that they require during the current year the sum of $760,000 for Coal Harbor and English Bay, building docks, tracks, and other facilities

at the Pacific terminus. This sum is really to be regarded as forming part of the money that we are now advancing to the company; and I think it altogether improper and indefensible to make that advance for that purpose. I just make that remark *en passant*, as to the western terminus. Then we come to the eastern end of the road, and the terminus was to have been at Callander. The Minister says, and I think fairly enough, that Callander was a point in the air, it was not a fitting terminus for a trans-continental railway. Then the Minister says that Montreal was the natural terminus. Well, I grant that; I grant that Montreal was the proper terminus. What this country wanted was to get communication between the business centres of the east and the Pacific Ocean—the port chosen in the Province of British Columbia. That was what the country was interested in getting. That was what the country had a right to pay for, and what the company—I submit with all deference to the greater business knowledge of gentlemen around me—ought to have devoted their energy to in the first instance. That was a task, as it was declared at the time when the measure was before Parliament, the construction of the road—that would tax the energies of the company quite sufficiently without going into other undertakings. Now if the company had confined themselves to the work that they undertook to do for this country what would the position have been? They would have been in a position to have gone into the money markets of the world and to have pointed to the liberal money subsidy they were getting, the large land grant and all the other advantages that they had, and, judging from the experience of railway companies, this company would have had no difficulty in borrowing in the London money market any sum of money which was necessary in order to enable them to complete their work. What did the company do? Instead of following that business-like course, almost the first thing they did when they got organized was to take a course which could have only one result: they immediately began to take such steps as to excite the hostility of other companies in the East. They began to acquire railways in the East, which had no direct connection with the object for which their contract was made, and the result of these operations—the natural and necessary result—was that the hostility of parties powerful in the London money market was excited; and when the Company found it necessary to look to that market for money they were unable to raise it, as they could have raised it, if they had not unnecessarily excited that hostility.

HON. MR. PLUMB—They were attacked by every body else on the hon. gentleman's side.

HON. MR. POWER—What was the character of the attack from the hon. gentleman's side? The character of the attack was this—it was stated in the other Chamber and in this Chamberalso that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were getting too good terms from the Government. Is that the sort of attack which was calculated to damage their credit in the money markets of the world? On the contrary. But with all the advantages that this company started with, one can understand how it happened that they did what they did. I have just indicated that they did a very foolish thing by unnecessarily exciting the hostility of people who are very powerful in the London money market, with the result that when this company wished to borrow money, which they could have borrowed if it had not been for that hostility, they were unable to borrow, and consequently they were driven back to the Parliament of Canada for more assistance, although they had declared themselves, and the government of the day had declared, and it had been proved conclusively that the first arrangement made with them was not only fair but liberal. That, I believe to be in truth the main secret of the want of success of this company in carrying out its work. The Minister undertook to say in a general way that this company has not spent anything outside of the contracted line—that they had so spent none of the money received from the Government. Looking at the last balance sheet of the company I find this:—and these sums are taken in in all the calculations with respect to the company and have to be borne in mind. It appears there from the report of the president and directors of the company

that they have expended the following amounts:

On the South Eastern Railway $1,595,280.

St. Lawrence & Ottawa Railway $227,155.

Two railways that were utterly unnecessary for the purposes of the company.

On the Atlantic & North West Railway $202,837.

On the Manitoba & South Western Colonization line $1,254,678.

Another railway which was unnecessary.

On the Ontario leased lines $1,265,450.

Making altogether $4,445,402.

Hon. gentlemen will see that that is a very considerable sum $4,500,000—which has been directly expended in these eastern speculations.

HON. MR. CARVELL—All Government money?

HON. MR. POWER—I have already said I was not prepared to go into those calculations, for the simple reason that I am not in the habit, as I regret to say some some hon. gentlemen are, of making statements which I am not prepared to stand by with respect to figures; and, further, these calculations have all been dealt with in the most thorough way in another place, and no attempt has been made to answer the argument with respect to these figures there—no attempt was made, although the speakers on the Government side were supplied with information by the officers of the company. I have no hesitation at all in saying that those eastern speculations are the principal cause why we have those people knocking at our doors again. They are the cause directly, because they have taken $4,500,000 out of the company, which should have been spent on the contracted line, and they are the cause indirectly, because they have ruined the credit of the company in the London money market. The hon. gentleman behind me wanted to know whether this was the money of the country, or not. I have already stated that I think it was, that it had been shown clearly in another place that it was: but that is not the question, and if the Minister showed as distinctly as possible that this was not the money of the country, his case would not yet be proved. Was it understood, when we undertook to hand the building of this railway over to a company, that we were to build the road, that we were to pay all that the road cost? Was not the great argument for handing it over to a company, and to the particular company to which it was handed, that they were immensely wealthy men and able to build the road without any help from the country, and that they would put a large amount of their own capital into this contracted line, and that what we were giving them was something fair and right, but it was not what was necessary?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Was not $10,000,000 a large sum?

HON. MR. POWER—What $10,000,000?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The $10,000,000 of their own money which they have put in.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman is only jesting.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No, I consider it is a large sum.

HON. MR. POWER—What amount of dividends have they taken out? They have taken out $5,000,000 in dividends.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Oh no! nothing like it.

HON. MR. POWER—The bulk of the stock was held by these people until very recently.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Oh no.

HON. MR. POWER—There is some stock held by the public but the bulk of it is held by them. I think the report of the president says something about that. We know that these men held $25,000,000 stock and I think the whole stock amounts to $65,000,000, and I think I have seen somewhere in the annual report that about $35,000,000 were held by them altogether.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Oh no. Only $15,000,000 held in Canada altogether.

HON. MR. MCINNES—Take the dividends and the amounts spent on the branch lines and how much is left?

HON. MR. PLUMB — What good would the main line be without the branches?

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman from Niagara I have no doubt is pretty familiar with this whole subject, and I have no doubt we shall hear from him by and by; but in the meantime I should like to get my small innings. The Minister said they had subscribed $10,000,000. The shareholders of the company have subscribed that much money, and they have taken out already I think about $5,000,000 in the shape of dividends.

HON. MR. SMITH—How would they take out $5,000,000?

HON. MR. POWER—These interruptions are not arguments and hon. gentleman know that the company have taken out this money. Now there are several millions more as the Minister tells us which are tied up, to pay dividends to the company. The $10,000,000 they put in has been more than swallowed up to pay and secure the dividends. The amount used to secure dividends comes I think altogether to $14,000,000, and no hon. gentleman will find it easy to show that they have put that much money into the road. Then, as has been suggested, when we come to add to that the amount of money that has been invested in those outside undertakings, we shall find that no money of the company has gone into the main road. That was shown as clearly as anything can be shown in the other Chamber. I am aware of the fact that a gentleman who stands as high in the counsels of the company as the hon. gentleman from Niagara, when the leader of the Opposition had closed his speech on the subject, said that that speech was unanswerable—a man who was quite as able to judge as the hon. member from Niagara: so the statement is not one which is so laughable. I have tried to show in a general way how it is that this undertaking, which promised so well at first and which we are told promises so well now, has called for such unexpected relief from the country. We were told when they came for the $30,000,000 or thereabouts that that was the last time of asking. So far as I remember the Minister did not say on this occasion that this was the last time of asking. I feel confident that before two years are over we shall have these same people coming for further assistance in another guise: because, with that desire to grasp everything around them, which I think is ther bane and which will be still more the bane of the country, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are now endeavoring to make further acquisitions of railroads throughout the country; and I have very little doubt that we shall be called upon within two years from this to assist in the construction of roads in the eastern part of the country, because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not money enough to build it themselves.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Hear, hear: that is what we want.

HON. MR. POWER—I think enterprise is a very good thing; and I understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, led by the distinguished American gentleman, VanHorne, who is the real moving and guiding spirit in the company, propose, in addition to killing out all competition in the railway business—I understand some of their prominent officials have made the statement—propose in a little while to have control of the telegraph, the telephone, and the express business of Canada. They already run the political business. I do not remember what reason the Minister gave why the company which had such flattering prospects and so valuable a property, and had been managed with such wonderful energy and skill were now so hard up for money. I have forgotten.

HON. MR. ALMON—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. POWER—Perhaps my hon. colleague would tell me.

HON. MR. ALMON—If I did not

know anything about it I would not speak on the subject.

HON. MR. POWER—I think it would be a good rule to observe about other things too.

HON. MR. ALMON—Example is better than precept.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not remember now what the exact reason was why the company were so hard up. I have tried to give what I think is the true reason.

HON. MR. DEVER—I suppose they want money.

HON. MR. POWER—There is one thing which I do happen to know on very fair authority about the company. When the company came last year asking for an advance from the Government it might have been noticed that some of the officers looked very much worried and were evidently in very serious trouble. I think any one who has paid attention to their movements and looks this year, has probably noticed that it is different now; and the reason I believe is that since last year the company have not invested their own money, and there is not any of their own money at risk now at all. They made up their minds, after the experience of last year, that in future all the money that was to be spent on the road should be expended not by the company but by the country; and we have the fact that, while the shareholders of the company—a great many of them—are very wealthy people, and while the stock of the company is so valuable, the men who have been doing the work for the road cannot get their money, and the company is issuing its paper, some of which I am informed has sold at a discount in the market of Montreal. The Minister said that we had no right to ask more than that the money went on the contracted line. We have reason to ask more than that. These people got the contract because they were wealthy men capable of implementing—I think that is the term the Minister of Railways of that time liked to use—

HON. MR. PLUMB—That was Mr. Blake's word.

HON. MR. POWER (continuing)—We had a right to expect that they should expend a reasonable amount of their own money on their road. The effect of this bill is that we advance the company $5,000,000 and instead of a first mortgage for $30,000,000 we take a mortgage for $20,000,000 and we admit $15,000,000 in addition along with us. Speaking of the cause of the failure of the company to carry out their contract without coming to us for more assistance, I left out of sight one matter to which the Minister of Justice adverted, and it is a very serious item—the Algoma branch. We have had the wisdom and skill of the policy of the company and its engineers held up to us many times; but I think the construction of that Algoma branch is a very fitting monument of the wisdom, skill and judgment of the people who have controlled the Canadian Pacific Railway. The company put $2,250,000 of the country's money into that branch, and then abandoned it and have let it lie idle and useless for a year. I think the line has been finished to Algoma Mills about a year, and it has been lying idle ever since. The company showed great enterprise in having steamers built for them in the old country; but I think they showed a lack of practical knowledge, inasmuch as when the steamers came out they found them too large for the service; and because of that mistake we are told the Algoma branch has to remain idle, and that $2,250,000 has to remain invested there earning nothing. Add that $2,250,000 to the amount I mentioned before, and you can understand why the company are short of money. The Minister having dealt directly with the provisions of the bill before us, undertook to deal with the charges which had been made against the character of the road. Now I do not propose to deal with that matter at any length, because I do not know enough about it to do so, but I know this: it is admitted by the Minister that there are permanent grades on that road in the Province of British Columbia of 116 feet to the mile. The contract that the company made was that their road was to be equal to the Union Pacific when it was completed, and the Minister entered into an argument to show why that contract was not to be strictly construed. He said:

what people generally understood by the Union Pacific was the whole road from Omaha to the Pacific—the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific taken together —and then the Minister read a communication from the American vice-president of the company instituting a comparison between the Union Pacific and the Canadian Pacific railway, which I thought was exceedingly unfair—I mean the comparison was unfair. The company said and the Government said that it was unfair to compare the road which is laid down in the statutory contract as being the standard for the Canadian Pacific Railway with our line. They say we should take the whole road—the Central Pacific along with the Union Pacific, that it is true the grades of the Union Pacific are not as steep as those on the Canadian Pacific Railway, but if you take the two roads together then the Canadian Pacific Railway, taken altogether, is better in the matter of grades. But what does the vice-president of the company do? When he comes to institute a comparison between the American and the Canadian road, he does not take the whole road, but takes the Central Pacific alone, the one on which the most difficult work of the American road was. Any one can see that it is most unfair. He says, take the 1000 miles or whatever it is of that Central Pacific and you get so many grades over 50 feet per mile; and then, instead of taking the section of the Canadian Pacific Railway corresponding with it—that is the section say between Calgary and the Pacific—he takes the whole, including the prairie section. Any one can see that is a most unfair comparison. If you wish to compare the two roads throughout then compare them throughout. If you want to compare the road from Winnipeg, take the American road from New York, or St. Lous, or some point like that. There is this feature, I think, in connection with the grades on the Kicking Horse Pass route which is a very objectionable one. One of the arguments which we heard a great deal of when this road was about being constructed, and at the time the contract was before Parliament, was that we would have a much better road than any American road.

Hon. Mr. POWER

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—So it is.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The company were not to be limited to this provision in the contract: that was put in the contract more as a matter of form than otherwise. It was not to be merely equal to the Union Pacific, but the intention was that it was to be superior; and it was pointed out that we had a great advantage over the United States lines because the summit in Canada was much lower than any pass through the Rocky Mountains in the United States, and the summit indicated was the Yellow Head Pass. Can it be supposed for a moment that if the United States company had a pass like the Yellow Head which they could go through without having a grade exceeding 53 feet to the mile that they would have adopted as a permanent thing the more difficult passes with steeper grades? Not at all. They were obliged to take the passes that they did take; but we had a pass which had been carefully surveyed and on which there was no grade exceeding 53 feet to the mile—I mean a road had been located there with gradients of that character.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is mistaken; the road was not located there.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The hon. gentleman may be sheltering himself behind a technicality. The road has been carefully surveyed there, the line laid down, and it was ascertained that no grade was over 53 feet to the mile; and it was stated in the contract with the company which I have before me now that the line should go through the Yellow Head Pass. Now the company chose, and the Government chose, as I think most improperly, in the face of the statute and in the face of their experience, to leave that admirable pass and select a pass where there are permanent grades of 116 feet to the mile; and the conduct of the Government and of the Company are both indefensible. The road across the prairies, I understand, is a very good one, and I am not saying anything against the character of the road as to workmanship; but I think it is a great misfortune that this route should have been taken through the mountains, because it handicaps the road forever as a

commercial and passenger route. The Minister of Justice animadverted in very strong terms upon the proposition which was moved by the leader of the Opposition in the other chamber that the company should take their own funds to pay their debts, instead of asking for more money from Parliament. I do not see that that is such a shocking proposition. In the first place, if the prospects of the company are as good as they are represented by the president in his report to be, I do not see why it is necessary to ask an advance of money from us at all; and certainly if it is a question whether the company shall advance the money or whether the country shall, I think it is quite clear that the company should do it. I put this to the Minister : a number of the shareholders and directors of this company are very wealthy men—the wealthiest men in Canada almost—that was one of the strongest arguments used in favor of our giving them the contract. Now the company want to raise $5,000,000 to pay off the men who have been working for them. Why should not these wealthy stockholders pay them? Why should they come to us for money ? If you contend that it is unfair to touch the fund which is there to secure dividends to all the shareholders, why should not the wealthy directors advance the money ? I think it is natural to expectthat they should do it rather than that the country should. If the shareholders of the company want money to pay their debts and to prevent their mortgage being foreclosed, they should be prepared to give up this guarantee that they shall get interest, and trust to the success of the undertaking for their interest; but if the shareholders did not wish to do that, then they should have advanced the money themselves, and not come to us. The Minister spoke as to what would happen if we took over the road. I think that when the company came to us 12 months ago for more money, we would have done perhaps wiser to have taken over the road. If they insist upon our taking over the road now, I am disposed to think it would be just as well that we should take it over; but I do not think it would be a very valuable property, because I think it would be found that the company have so arranged things that those parts of the undertaking from which the large returns that the Minister read of come do not form part of the contracted line, and they are not covered by the mortgage which the country holds; and it is not an impossible thing that by and by, just as Mr. McIntyre has got out of the concern and taken his $2,000,000, and as Mr. Kennedy has got out and taken a very considerable sum with him, the old contractors will get out of the company, and possibly the country may take over the contracted line and find they have not a particularly valuable property. If the property is so valuable it is rather remarkable that the stock of the company is so low in the market. The Minister seemed to misapprehend a remark which I made about Russia. I thought that Canada becoming such a country as Russia would be a misfortune. Russia is governed by an autocrat. The remark of the Minister was calculated to suggest the idea that we were about establishing a despotism for Canada to be controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I think that was an unfortunate suggestion. I have every confidence in the future of the country. I think that our North-West must, in the not remote future, have a very considerable population, because there is now comparatively little land suited for settlement available in the United States. The land there has been nearly taken up; and our land is, as a rule, better than theirs, and it will be the only land available for settlement. I have no doubt that in the next 20 years —that is if the country gets a somewhat better government than it has now, and we get rid of the monopoly that is exercised by this railway, and give the people of the North-West representative institutions—probably in less time, we shall have a considerable population there.

HON. MR KAULBACH—How do you propose to get rid of the monopoly?

HON. MR. POWER—As I stated at the beginning, I regret that I was not as well informed on this subject as I should be, and that I was not as well prepared to deal with the elaborate argument of the Minister of Justice as I should be; but I think I have said enough to show at any rate why the Company are in the position

in which they are, and that the character of the road is not all that we might have expected as regards the pass through the mountains.

The motion was agreed to and the Bill was read the second time.

TIMBER CULLING BILL.

IN THE COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (154), "An Act to further amend the Acts relating to the culling and measuring of timber in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec."

In the Committee.

HON. MR. PELLETIER—I hope the Minister will reconsider the clause which provides for the reduction of the cullers of staves and spars. While I was in Quebec lately I met several of the cullers, and they all complained that the proposed reduction in the number of cullers of staves and masts was too great. The number now is five, and one of them devotes his attention exclusively to culling masts. In reducing the number to three only two would remain for the culling of staves and laths. The one who culls masts knows nothing about staves and laths. They all contend, and the supervisor of cullers there thinks, that the reduction from five to three is too great, because only two would remain for the culling of staves and masts.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I will consider the suggestion of the hon. gentleman and mention it to the Minister. We can report the Bill now, and if any amendment should be considered necessary it can be made at the third reading.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.) from the Committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION BILL.

REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (156) "An Act to restrict and regulate Chinese Immigration into Canada."

In the Committee,

On the 5th clause,

HON. MR. ALMON—I have an amendment to move in this case. There are 18,000 Chinese already settled in British Columbia and are allowed to remain inhabitants of that province. They came out there to work on the railway and, of course, having no money to bring their wives with them, they came alone, and you are keeping 18,000 men in the vigor of manhood in that place without the possibility of contracting any connubial tie. What will be the result of it? If violence takes place on women, who will be to blame for it? Will it be those 18,000 men, or will it be this House who compel them to live there without being able to contract marriage? It would be well to amend the Bill so that a Chinaman can send to his own country and bring out his wife. In our country a man in contracting marriage does not buy a pig in a poke, but in China it is different, where in 99 cases out of 100 the man does not see the woman to whom he is to be married until the day he is married, and there is nothing inconsonant with their habits and customs for a man to send home an order to his parents to have a wife sent out to him.

HON. MR. NELSON—At present there is no restriction on Chinese females coming into British Columbia; yet they come in exceedingly small numbers. In fact there is no Chinese woman of good character at all allowed to leave China, and those who come to this country are of the very worst class. None but Chinese prostitutes come to the country, and if you were to give them this privilege I do not think it would be of any benefit.

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am very much struck with what the hon. gentleman from British Columbia has just said. Before he spoke I had no objections to altering the clause in the way the hon. gentleman from Halifax suggests, but, as pointed out by the hon. gentleman op-

posite, the women that come would very likely be prostitutes.

HON. MR. ALMON—In the case of Australia, a number of female immigrants went out from England that were prostitues. Those women married there and became, the majority of them, very decent women, and the singular thing mentioned is that while in London on the streets they had no children, out there they had children, and their descendants are some of the most respectable people in the place. Therefore I do not believe what my hon. friend says that no one will come out to British Columbia but prostitutes, and even if it were so, it is better to have those men marry those prostitutes than to be allowed to remain with all the passions and vigor of manhood without any restraint.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The Bill is too restricted now, but certainly if females do not come out under the present circumstances, they are not likely to be encouraged to come by the amendment of the hon. gentleman from Halifax.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I think we are legislating with a great deal of ignorance of the social life of the Chinese. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not understand, or perhaps I do not understand thoroughly, what the social habits and conditions of those people are who are coming here. I do not think the hon. gentleman understands the Chinese marriage arrangement at all. I do not think the class of women who are wives are likely to come with the laborers who are brought out and are the kind of immigrants we are legislating against now. They have no marriage tie, or marriage arrangement: and unless I am much mistaken in regard to the condition of Chinese society, as far as it affects these people, I should object very much to any arrangement by which an unlimited number of the other sex should be brought out, as would be the case if my hon. friend's amendment were accepted. You might provide that a man for every 50 tons of shipping may come out, and that he may have a partner: but there really is no immigration of virtuous women with Chinese laborers. That is well known to everybody who knows anything about the habits of the Chinese.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—It must be borne in mind that Chinamen do not come to remain in this country. They intend to go back to their own country after they have made money. A few women do come, and some are prostitutes and some are good women. Some of the wives of merchants in British Columbia are very good women. We do not wish to make an abiding place in our country for those people at all. They do not bring their domestic comforts with them. They only come to stay in the country a short time, and they associate with the Indian women a good deal.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Some Chinese come with their wives. Why not encourage them and other Chinese who come to bring their wives with them?

HON. MR. NELSON—I have known of no case where respectable women came into the country from China. I know of cases where Chinese merchants have taken some of the women brought into the country and married them and they have afterwards become respectable, but no respectable women come into the country from China in that way.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I hope my hon. friend will not press his amendment.

HON. MR. ALMON—As I am going to move the three months' hoist on the third reading I will not press the amendment, and, with the permission of the House, I will withdraw it.

The amendment was withdrawn and the clause was agreed to.

On the 17th clause,

HON. MR. POWER—I would ask the Minister of Justice if he does not think this a rather sweeping provision. No doubt if the sentence of those tribunals involves death or any very serious bodily injury, one could see the necessity for such a provision in the Bill, but if those people who live by themselves—forming a sort of *imperium in imperio*—if they are able to preserve order amongst themselves and keep things working satisfactorily by these courts without troubling

their neighbors, I really do not see why severe penalties should be imposed upon them for doing so. Unless the lives and limbs of the members of the community are threatened, I think that Chinamen should be allowed to settle their own disputes.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not understand the question myself. Perhaps some hon. gentlemen from British Columbia will explain it.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—I believe they do have some secret tribunals, but the difficulty is about evidence. They all look so much alike, and they do not tell the truth, that there should be a clause that they shall have no trial among themselves; but that they should come to the courts of the country. It is supposed that they have some means of punishing offenders amongst themselves by a summary way, perhaps by taking life.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—If there is no manifest evil in connection with their tribunal I do not see why we should legislate in this way. We allow the Indians to have their own social arrangements and civil rights, and why not allow the Chinaman to have his?

HON. MR. ALMON—I think this clause is contrary to the genius of the 19th century and to the rules of the Christian religion.

HON. MR. NELSON—It is generally supposed, in fact it was a subject of inquiry and brought to the attention of the judges of the Supreme Court very lately, and I think it is in a report made by the commissioners who went out from British Columbia, that the Supreme Court judges spoke very strongly of some secret organizations of that kind by which the Chinese take the punishment of offenders into their own hands. Large numbers of crimes are committed in British Columbia and throughout the province by Chinese, and no trace of the murderers in those cases could be discovered, and no parties could be found to give evidence; and crimes of that character go unpunished. The fact of people being taken off in that way has led to the suspicion, whether properly founded or not, that they have been condemned to death through some secret organizations.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—It seems to me that the provision at the end of the clause is sufficient to meet any *bona fide* right that the Chinese have amongst themselves; but as we must be prepared by some means to control the bad class of Chinese, it would not be wise to allow them to deal with criminal matters with their own laws when they have the laws of the country to appeal to.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Undoubtedly they ought to be taught to respect our laws. As long as they have secret tribunals amongst themselves, they will not do so, and, no doubt, this clause was placed here with a better knowledge of the necessity of it than perhaps we have here. At any rate it can do no harm, and if it should be found that it is oppressive in any way, the Act can be dealt with hereafter.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Is it not found in almost every community, amongst all Christian bodies, that each sect has a court in which to regulate the duties and obligations of the persons belonging to it? We find it in all religious bodies, and we find it in other bodies. We find that a man may be expelled from a Church, and from certain societies, because he does not conform to the rules laid down for the guidance of such society. I do not know how far these secret organizations among the Chinese go, but if they should have courts of their own for deciding petty offences and disputes, I cannot see why they should be interfered with.

HON. MR. POWER—We have the best evidence we can get here before us, and I suppose it is as good as any they had in the other Chamber, and it does not show that there is any serious objection to those courts—that is, provided there is some limitation to their power. The only thing that is said against those courts is, that sometimes their sentence is death. This clause might be amended by inserting after the word "tribunal" in the fourth line, 5th page, words like these "which involve death or bodily injury to any per-

son." The law will be violated; they will go on and hold their secret tribunals, but perhaps if the law was less sweeping in its character they would be more likely to observe it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I observe that in the report of the Chinese Commission they quote the opinion of judges and others on this subject.

HON. MR. KAULBACH — There seems to have been a lot of unsubstantial vague evidence brought before that Commission. The effect of this law may be to render their secret societies more secret. If they violate the law now, they are liable to be punished by the law of the country.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

The motion was agreed to.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

AFTER RECESS.

MANITOBA CLAIMS BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (155) "An Act for the final settlement of the claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion."

HON. MR. BELLEROSE, from the Committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

The bill was then read the third time and passed.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of Bill (103), "An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise."

HON MR. HAYTHORNE—It is not necessary that I should speak at any length on the third reading of this Bill, as I had the honor of addressing the House on the second reading; but I said then that I should move an amendment on the third reading, with a view to the perpetuation of the Electoral Franchise in Prince Edward Island, in the manner in which it is at present. Hon. gentlemen may readily conceive that this is a task which to me takes the form of a duty. The amendment which I am about to move is one that I can recommend to this House with the greater confidence, because ten years ago the Senate interfered to preserve the existing franchise of Prince Edward Island. I referred to the circumstances of that occasion the other day, and perhaps it is unnecessary for me to repeat them at length now; but this I will say that the action then taken by this House has been most kindly remembered in our Province from that day to this. It is generally the case that when a number of the freemen of that Province meet together for the discussion of public affairs, they are very apt to remember the part the Senate of Canada took on that occasion. Although the seats are not very full this evening, there are not a few gentleman listening to me now who took part in the debate, although ten years make a sad inroad upon a body constituted as this Senate is, and during that period we have to regret the passing away of a quite a number of gentlemen who then took an active part in the proceedings of this body. Still, unless I am greatly mistaken, there are more than a few members present to-day who assisted in preserving the franchise of Prince Edward Island on that occasion. I appeal to those gentlemen, especially, to once more preserve this franchise, and I appeal to other gentlemen who occupy the seats of those who have passed away from us to take the same action this evening as their predecessors did upon the former occasion. I think, myself, that this can be done without any great breach of party fealty. It seems to me an action worthy of the Senate, that without any break, or decided interference with a Government measure, we can say to the people of that province "We sympathize with your apprehensions, and we are willing to maintain for you, as much as in us lies, all the rights and privileges which are part of your inheritance." The Government having already conceded so far as to allow existing voters in Prince Edward Island to retain their suffrages during the term of

their natural lives, it is only a small further concession to ask that they should be able to tell their children that what they have gained for themselves they are able to pass down to them, and to express a hope that they will be as faithful and careful to preserve it as their fathers had been. I would not by any means be ashamed to point to the political history of that province. If I were to do so at any length I should tell a story of a hard struggle for liberties and for rights which have been enjoyed by most other parts of Canada. I should tell of a manly, consistent struggle carried on for years; I should tell of some unhappy infractions of the law, and I should tell, also, that in solving the great question which agitated the people of Prince Edward Island, they accomplished their object at last, and no proprietor of land in any part of the country could say that he was wronged out of a shilling in parting with his vested rights. I would ask hon. gentlemen is it at all likely that men who would act in that way would easily part with so valuable a privilege as they once enjoyed? If so I have formed a very inadequate appreciation of their political principles and feelings, and when I speak in this way I speak not of one party only, because I am well aware that these same principles are held by the men of both parties there. If it were necessary to bring evidence of that before this House I should point to the fact that the four members from Prince Edward Island who were in the House of Commons when the division was taken on the Franchise Bill, and when an amendment similar to this which I hold in my hand was moved, all voted for it. I think that having explained the position of my province, and having spoken of the right which people have to maintain and preserve perfectly inviolate their political rights, it will be sufficient for me to read my resolution to this House, and to call upon its members to give it their cordial support. I shall therefore make this motion :—

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be amended by striking out in the ninth clause the words "and Prince Edward Island" in the 18th and 19th lines, and by striking out the word "respectively" in the 28th line, and by inserting as a sub-section to clause nine the following :—

"In the Province of Prince Edward Island the provincial qualification of voters shall continue to be the qualification of voters for the election of members of the House of Commons."

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island has made an appeal to his co-members who were here some ten years ago when a question arose with regard to the electoral franchise of the voters in Prince Edward Island, which was proposed to be taken away by the then existing government, and as I was one of those to whom he appeals permit me to say a few words. I entirely agree with the hon. member that it is a very difficult, and I may add in all consistency, an improper thing for any government or any parliament to take away the existing franchise enjoyed by any particular body of electors, without first submitting the question to them for their consideration, in order that they may have an opportunity of voting upon it. Had this Bill come up before us in the form in which it was presented first to the House in another place I should most certainly have gone with my hon. friend in any motion that he might make to preserve the existing franchise to the electors of Prince Edward Island in the same way that they now enjoy it until they had a constitutional opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it, and I should have done that in all consistency, because referring for a moment, not with a view to reviving any difference of opinion, but to a precedent which existed in the Province of Nova Scotia, I should be compelled to take that course. On that occasion in the year 1863—I am sorry to say so long ago as 22 years—a motion was made by the then existing Premier, and a Bill was brought in by him (I allude to the late Hon. Joseph Howe) which proposed to take away the franchise that had existed for some six or seven years or more in the province of Nova Scotia, embracing what is called resident suffrage—that is to say that every person resident in the country, who was over 21 years of age, had a franchise. On that occasion I as one of the Conservative party acting in concert with the whole body of Conservatives voted against that Bill as it stood then, unless it was qualified by a provision that the existing electors should have an opportunity of passing upon that measure,

because while we admitted at once the constitutional right of the House to change its franchise either by lowering or by elevating it, we yet protested against the doctrine that the rights of people should be taken away without their consent and without them having an opportunity of expressing their opinion. Therefore, I repeat that had this Bill come before us in the form in which it was first presented I should certainly have gone with my hon. friend to protect the rights of those people in some way or other. The mode in which that was dealt with I have already intimated. It was a bill to take away the franchise, and when it came up to the place in the legislature of Nova Scotia, which corresponds to the position that this House occupies in the Dominion Parliament I, after feeling my way to know exactly how I stood, took upon myself the responsibility to move that clause. I moved a rider to the effect that the Act should not go into operation until after the next general election, and that was carried; and I may say, as a bit of provincial history, that that little rider, which was only passed by a majority of one, had a most material effect upon the future fortunes of Nova Scotia and, I may add, of this Canada of ours, because when the election took place it led to a change of Government. The Liberal or Reform Government which pressed that bill to disfranchise those people, were turned out of power and the Conservatives came in. It was then that the present Sir Charles Tupper—at that time Dr. Tupper—became provincial secretary, and he remained in power three or four years. The election took place in 1863, and in the very first session of the new Parliament the hon. member, who had joined in opposing that bill, moved a resolution for the appointment of commissioners to settle the question of maritime union with Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick which led, as is now a part of our history, to the larger union in which we now stand. Therefore I shall refer no further to the part I took in it myself, for which I got little credit afterwards from those who benefited by it, although I got a very considerable amount of credit and some abuse at the time, as to which I may say I care nothing, because it is a matter of no consequence to me whether I get credit or not. I did it as a matter of duty to protect the interests of people who were not there to protect themselves, and I should do the same with regard to the people of Prince Edward Island, but this is a very different case. In this instance the rights of existing electors are preserved by this Bill. They are allowed the privilege which they now enjoy, and my hon. friend seeks to carry that protection down to those who come after them on the ground, as he puts it, that they should have the right to transmit to those who come after them the same powers that they have themselves. Now the right of voting is not a right that a man can will or transmit to his sons. It is a personal right, a right which he enjoys under the constitution and which is given to him by law, and there is no pretence that under this Bill injury is done to anybody who now enjoys the right of voting. That right still remains, and my hon. friend might have simply effected his purpose by moving this amendment and with a much greater degree of clearness, I think, if he had struck out in the 21st line "every person who at the time of the passing of the same;" that would have left the words to read "every person who is of the age of 21 years, etc." The amendment would have effected what he desires better than by asking the House to commit themselves to a principle which, if adopted, I do not hesitate to say, would lead to this Bill being wholly recast. My hon. friend, not content with taking the opinion of the House by striking out these words applying the provision to everbody, asks the House to commit themselves to a separate sub-section by which they declare that the provincial franchise shall be the Dominion franchise. Therefore my hon. friend has put his case in a form most unfavorable to himself and to the views for which he contends. But as far as my impression goes the Act at the present time is entirely right and has gone as far as it is possible, or as far as my hon. friend could have expected the House to go. My hon. friend deserves all credit, not alone for the action he has taken this evening on behalf of his people, but for his continual advocacy of their rights. I sympathize with his efforts, and am disposed to accord to my hon. friend every credit for them, but I take it for granted

he can hardly expect that this House will stultify themselves, and incorporate a principle in that Bill, which will lead to its being wholly recast, but that he wishes simply to record his opinions upon it, and the opinions of gentlemen who may be disposed to vote with him ; but while I am fully disposed to protect, and should have stood by his side in protecting, the interests of any persons who are proposed to be disfranchised, I shall certainly not follow him so far as prospectively to legislate for people who have no franchise now, but who may hereafter be placed in the same position as those who have, because if that principle were admitted it would be impossible for Parliament to alter any franchise if it were once given.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I wish to explain the vote which I am about to give on this amendment. If I am not mistaken the franchise in Prince Edward Island is universal suffrage. To that franchise, as I said before, I am quite opposed, but in this instance it is proposed to give to that province the franchise which she enjoys to-day. As I stated at a former stage of this Bill, we have in this Dominion many provinces, and the fairest way would have been to have left to each province its own franchise. Therefore, I am bound to give my vote in support of the amendment, and though the hon. gentleman from Amherst (Mr. Dickey) took exception to it on account of the difficulty in the way of going on with the Bill, I do not believe that it could be called a valid objection, because this Bill only reached us two or three days ago, and we must take our time to legislate in a proper way. If it requires one day more to put the Bill in a proper shape, we should take that time and mature the measure. Therefore, I do not consider that it is a strong argument against the amendment. If this House, which is supposed to be more conservative than the popular branch, would consider a little the opinion expressed by the Minister of Justice himself when he stated the other day that his own idea was to leave to each province its own franchise, I suppose it would not be difficult for this House to vote in that direction.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend must pardon me if I correct him. I said that that was my first thought until I heard further, and then I willingly gave way.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I suppose with one or two hours' work we could have the Bill recast so as to put it in a shape which would satisfy the whole of the people throughout the Dominion, but as it is now it will cause dissatisfaction. It changes the franchise in every province of the Dominion, and therefore the best way would be to recast the Bill now. I will support the amendment for the reason I have given.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I refrained from saying anything on this Bill at the second reading, because the Minister of Justice was anxious that the House should come to a vote at that particular sitting and I supposed that an opportunity would be afforded to discuss the measure at a later stage. We find ourselves face to face with a franchise Bill prepared by the House of Commons, whom it more particularly concerned, and anything which we might say on the subject here has already been stated very fully there. I was somewhat surprised at the opposition that arose to this Bill. It was not for a moment pretended that the Government had no power to introduce a Bill of this kind ; on the contrary, it has been admitted by my hon. friend from DeSalaberry in this House that the Government have that power. The Bill has been introduced, and I think I may say, without exaggeration, that it has been pretty freely discussed, and the opinions of gentlemen whom it more immediately concerns are well understood. I am surprised that the leader of the Opposition in this House, instead of allowing the bill to go to committee to be considered and modified, moved the six months' hoist, and I am surprised that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island should have assisted him, because if that vote had been carried it would have been impossible to amend the bill.

HON. MR. PELLETIER—There would have been no necessity to amend it.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—My hon. friend who proposes this amendment asks this

House to do as it did in 1874. I say, without discussing the bill clause by clause and point by point, that there is no analogy between this bill and the measure to which he refers. The bill which we had before us in 1874 was one which allowed no man to vote in Prince Edward Island unless he had $333 worth of real estate.

HON. MR. PLUMB—By whom was that introduced?

HON. MR. HOWLAN—By the Mackenzie Government.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—That would have taken away some 25 per cent. of the voters of Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment and myself appealed to this House to consider the position in which it would place the people of Prince Edward Island, and asked as one of the smaller provinces, the protection which we had a right to expect from the Senate. We received that consideration, and the franchise was preserved to the people of Prince Edward Island, and they have been thankful for that preservation, and with the exception of one constituency the whole province has returned supporters of the party which protected them on that occasion. The hon. gentleman who proposes this amendment contends that this House should not go back on what was its expressed opinion at that time, but as I have said there is a wide difference between the two measures. There is no question in my mind, or in the minds of hon. gentlemen acquainted with the subject, that the people of Prince Edward Island are in favor of manhood suffrage. I am aware that a very respectable minority indeed of the gentlemen composing the other branch of Parliament are also in favor of that suffrage. I am myself unreservedly in favor of it, and I have never hesitated to say so. I do not agree with the hon. member from DeLanaudiere that it is a wretched franchise, and the reason why I am in favor of the Bill before us is that it tends towards manhoood suffrage. A man must be a very poor student of the every-day incidents of the Dominion if he cannot see that we are fast moving towards manhood suffrage.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—Hear hear.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I am surprised at the hon. gentleman's "hear hear." Our system of government is by a majority, and when the majority pronounce on that particular question it is beyond the power of the minority to alter it: but I wish to show how different this Bill is to the one we had under consideration in 1874. That was absolute. We have in Prince Edward Island an elective upper House with one franchise: we have our House of Assembly with another franchise, this manhood suffrage. Every man who comes to the age of 21 years can vote if he pays one dollar taxes and resides one year in the province. If he cannot find the $1 he can work four days on the roads and be entitled to vote The other franchise is $333 on real estate. How different is this! It allows the father and sons to vote—the step-father's and step-mother's sons also. If you add the uncle and aunt you include everybody. I know that this arrangement was made in the interests of Prince Edward Island. The first provision made is that the franchise of those in Prince Edward Island who had the right to vote in the last election shall be preserved. With regard to the franchise, generally, there are several alterations which meet the views of the people of Prince Edward Island. For instance, fishermen's sons and farmers' sons are entitled to vote, and the fisherman himself, who absolutely owns no land, but has got a stand on the shore and a fishing net and a boat, has a right to vote, and his son also. The farmer has a vote, himself, and as many votes for his sons as the farm will give. The grandfather, the father-in-law, the mother-in-law, the step-father, and the step-mother all are included. This Bill will not rob the people of Prince Edward Island of their votes in the same way as the Bill of 1874 would have done. The grandson could not have voted, nor any of the sons of the farmer under the Bill of 1874, but they can vote now. The fisherman's son, or even the fisherman, could not have voted under the Bill of 1874. Therefore I say this measure is a much more liberal Bill. There is no comparison; but in the appeal which my

hon. friend has made to the Senate I think he should have stated clearly the difference between the two measures so that the Senate might understand it and we would be in a position to vote intelligently. I have no hesitation in saying that I am going to vote with my hon. friend on his amendment.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—My hon. friend says "hear, hear." I am not at all satisfied that the amendment will carry, because it has been already pronounced upon in the other House. With regard to one thing, my hon. friend has stated in his speech that this Bill would not be acceptable to the people of Prince Edward Island, or they would be placed in a false position because they would have to go before a judge, and, as I took down a note of his speech, the judge or barrister would be sent down from here. I do not wish to misquote my hon. friend. Did I understand him to say so?

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—That is not exactly what I said. I said something to this effect—it might be a barrister from Ottawa or elsewhere.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Then I have taken down my hon. friend's remark properly. Now, as I understand, it is not the intention to take barristers from here to serve in any other locality—the barrister will be appointed in the locality where he resides.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Of course that is it.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Therefore the objection that a barrister might be sent from Ottawa to Prince Edward Island entirely falls to the ground. With reference to the difficulty of any person going before a judge I can only say this: I have run eleven elections, myself, and in my experience I do not think a voter would be any more displeased to go before a judge than he would be to go before a bantering crowd of his own neighbours with regard to his qualification as a voter. The matter struck me in that light. Again with regard to the question of Indian voters, I confess I cannot see anything wrong about an Indian having a vote if he is possessed of property and is a permanent resident. I really can see no reason why an Indian who has a farm, on which he works, and which is to all intents and purposes his own, a man who can read and write and who pays his taxes and conforms to the laws of this country—I can see no reason why he should be refused a vote.

HON. MR. DICKEY—There is nothing in the Bill to prevent it

HON. MR. HOWLAN—I know there is not; that is what I say, and I can see no ground for the objection to the Indian vote. I am endeavoring to meet the objections which have been raised by some hon. gentlemen on that point. This matter of the franchise is to me, who have lived in a country where we have a free franchise, perfectly clear; to my mind manhood suffrage is the proper franchise, and if this Bill did not lead in that direction I should be inclined to vote against it, but I say it is a stepping stone to a free franchise. We must not forget this, that when we entered the Dominion of Canada as a province we did so to take our proper share of the burdens as well as the advantages of the union, and as the constitution gives the Dominion a right to legislate on this subject, and as this Bill has been passed after a very thorough discussion, and the public mind of the Dominion has been pretty well settled with regard to it, I do not see why we should seek to amend the Bill to meet our particular views. I have no hesitation in saying that if, under the working of this Bill, it should be found that any portion of our people are robbed of their votes, if the Parliament of Canada is appealed to it will remedy the wrong.

HON. MR. MONTGOMERY—If this Bill had come down as it was originally introduced, I should certainly have voted for the amendment. The hon. gentleman from Marshfield (Mr. Haythorne) has appealed to us to act on this occasion as we did in 1874, when a bill was introduced affecting the franchise in Prince Edward Island, but he seems to forget that the concessions made in this Bill were not made in that measure. I believe that the representatives of the Island are gen-

erally satisfied with the concessions made in this Bill to their province, and I am also. I think the House has acted in a very liberal manner towards Prince Edward Island.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—My hon. friend opposite has moved an amendment to the Franchise Bill which provides that his province shall be excepted from the operation of the Bill. An amendment was made in the other House to the effect that all those who are enrolled upon the Prince Edward Island voters' list should remain as such voters. That was departing really from the principle of uniformity in favor of the hon. gentleman's province. My hon. friend on my right (Mr. Howlan) has well said that when the hon. gentleman and his friends chose to cast in their lot with the Dominion they did so with a full knowledge that this Parliament had power to establish a uniform franchise for the confederation. They never could have supposed, until they heard the hon. member from DeLanaudiere speak, that the province of Quebec would solemnly advocate the principle of universal suffrage. They never could have supposed, except under the strange conditions which bring together those singular bed fellows—my hon. friend from DeLanaudiere and my hon. friend from Marshfield—that there could be any possibility that a Franchise Bill could be framed which would have recognized the principle of universal suffrage in Canada. I wish to remind my hon. friend of what has been brought to our notice by my hon. friend at my right (Mr. Howlan) that he was compelled, for the protection of his province, in 1874 to stand up against his own Liberal Government which proposed not only to disfranchise his people utterly (Oh, Oh!) yes, utterly, on the principle of universal suffrage, but to require that every man should own a certain portion of real estate before he could be a voter at all—not admitting taxpayers, or farmers' sons, or many of those who are entitled to vote under this illiberal Tory measure.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It was only a temporary bill.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—I do not care whether it was temporary or not. My hon. friend is quite mistaken; it was intended to affect the franchise of Prince Edward Island and to prevent a large portion of its population, who had up to that time enjoyed the suffrage, from voting in elections for the Dominion Parliament, and my hon. friend from Marshfield is too candid to dispute for one moment the position I am taking.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—He will explain it.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB—It will require a great deal of ingenuity to explain it away. It is one thing to explain, and another thing to explain away. My hon. friend will see that the most tender regard has been paid to the voters of Prince Edward Island. Every man who is entitled to vote will continue to possess the franchise. Nobody is disfranchised, and not only that, but there are men absolutely admitted to the franchise—sons of fishermen and farmers' sons. But my hon. friend says he objects, on the other hand, to the Indians voting. All his friends are making the same objection; they are objecting to the enlargement of the franchise on the one side, and they are representing it as being too restrictive on the other. It is impossible to please the hon. gentleman and get at any common point upon which we can agree. My hon. friend from DeLanaudiere, whom I know to be Conservative of Conservatives, has stated that there is universal dissatisfaction against this franchise because it is too liberal and sweeping. Other gentlemen of his way of thinking say the same thing, and yet he advocates that there shall be a more sweeping measure still—in fact that the principle of universal suffrage which, in a franchise Bill like this, once admitted as a general principle, must affect the whole principle of the Bill and must be carried through all the provinces—my hon. friend who is so logical usually, has actually committed himself to the principle of universal suffrage. Well, he is quite welcome to do so but I wish to have one thing understood, that is, that this conservative Senate in 1874 saved the franchise of Prince Edward Island. This conservative Senate proposes now to agree with the proposition of the House of Commons, by which all the voters who are registered in Prince Edward Island shall still have

the privilege of recording their votes. I say we may come, some time or other, to the general principle of universal suffrage, but, in language which my hon. friend opposite will understand, our principle should be *festina lente.* The time may come when he and all the rest of us will have to agree to manhood suffrage, but for the present we have a measure which is largely in advance of any general suffrage measure which has been adopted for the provinces of this Dominion. I shall vote for it and I trust that the amendment of my hon. friend, well meant as it is—for I can well understand the delicate position in which he and my hon. friend from Alberton are placed—will be rejected. If adopted, it would be fatal to a Bill which has enlarged the privileges of the general voting population of the Dominion, and I know my hon. friend, when he comes to think of it seriously, would not be the means, in any way, of obstructing those privileges, as he would do if an amendment of this kind were adopted.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B.C.)—As I have not taken any part in this debate on the Franchise Bill, and as British Columbia is as greatly affected probably as any other part of the Dominion, I hope I may be allowed to say a word or two on this subject. I am quite in accord with the amendment that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island has moved. I believe it is a step in the right direction. We have had in the Province of British Columbia universal suffrage, for a great number of years, and our experience is that it has worked admirably. To take this retrogressive step, is contrary to the spirit of the age in which we live. I think a great mistake was made that this subject of the franchise was not submitted to the different provinces before a Bill was framed—I think it was a great mistake, notwithstanding the difference of opinion held by many hon. gentlemen in this House. If the feelings of the different provinces had been tested, I am sure we would not have been sitting here until this late period of the summer. As I said before, I think the tendency is to extend the franchise instead of curtail it.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It has been done by this Bill.

HON. MR. MCINNES—Only in some of the provinces. I do not see why those provinces which are further advanced in some things than the larger members of the confederation should be deprived of privileges which they have enjoyed for a number of years. I believe if the Government had brought in a Bill, in the first place, adopting universal suffrage such as we have in British Columbia, it would have been acceptable to the vast majority of the people of Canada. I believe it will be but a few years before this Bill, which has cost the country so much valuable time and will cost a great deal of money in the operation of it, with its half dozen or more different qualifications, will be swept off the Statute book and universal suffrage adopted. We are drifting in that direction, and I believe and hope that all of us will see it in a few years. For these reasons I will support the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island?

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—I should like to know if the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment wishes us to legislate to give universal suffrage to Prince Edward Island?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—If the amendment was to leave to the Local Legislature the right to regulate the franchise I would vote in favor of the amendment, although it might lead to universal suffrage.

HON. MR. SCOTT—That is what it is.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Oh, no, it is not.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—By this amendment it is not asked that the regulation of the suffrage should be left to the local legislature, but that we should legislate that universal suffrage continue in Prince Edward Island. Therefore there are two points involved. I am certainly in favor of, and would vote for an amendment giving to the local legislature the right to deal with the franchise in that province.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I will read it :—"In the Province of Prince Edward Island the provincial qualification of voters shall continue to be the qualification of voters for the election of members of the House of Commons."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We are asked to enact that.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—That is the way I understood it. We do not tell the Local Government that they shall regulate the franchise, but we say—we, the Parliament of Canada, declare that they shall continue to have universal suffrage.

HON. MR. SCOTT—No, no.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—I may not understand the language well, but that is the way it presents itself to me.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—You understand it correctly.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—I am in favor of leaving to the local legislatures the fixing of the franchise, but I object to the Dominion Parliament declaring that we are in favor of universal suffrage. I have opposed the bill, not because I consider it is not liberal enough, but because I consider it is too liberal, and having voted against the Government measure on that ground, I think I must, to be consistent, vote against this amendment.

HON. MR. VIDAL—I must confess that I am not a little surprised that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island whose candor and clearness of statement and fairness are so fully and constantly recog nized, should to-night try to put so many of us in a false position by his reference to the vote in this House in 1874 upon the Prince Edward Island Bill. In my judgment there is no analogy whatever between the two cases. In the one instance there was an attempt to interfere with one single province, and to deprive many of the people of that province of the exercise of a right which they had enjoyed—an interference which we in our wisdom and exercising the duties rightly and properly devolving upon us, put a stop to. The hon. gentleman alluded to the functions of this House in relation to this matter. I recognize those functions fully, and I think if there is any one thing which should be kept in view more than another in this House it is that we are here to protect the rights of the provinces. The *raison d'être* of the Senate is to accomplish that end, so that the preponderating vote in the other House, of any large province, should not bear unduly on any province having a smaller representation. I think the hon. gentleman, in the motion he has made, entirely misapprehends the intention of the Bill, and what the Bill would actually accomplish if carried into force I look upon this measure as granting a very large extension of the franchise—giving the privilege to many thousands of persons who have hitherto not enjoyed the right of voting for members of the House of Commons. I believe in some few cases it may prove to be a Bill disfranchising some who have hitherto had a vote ; but when we look at the fact that the qualification is placed so very low, I think that no valid objections can possibly be urged against it. I feel myself that it is a very unfortunate thing that the concession has been made which we find embodied in this Bill. Strongly as I would like to protect the rights of every man and to disfranchise none, still the matter is such an important one, the bringing of the franchise into one uniform system, that I think it is a pity that in the case of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia there has been a departure from this rule of uniformity. I fully sympathize with the motive that led to that departure, a desire to act with the greatest liberalty, and allow a defect in the measure for the purpose of doing justice to those people. When we look at the franchise in Prince Edward Island, in the first place we see there will be a voters' list on that very low basis which is to prevail throughout the Dominion ; then there is a provision that those who are not qualified on that basis will have the same right to vote that they enjoy to-day. Now if that provision were not made, I believe that before the next general election takes place for the House of Commons we would not find the name of a single one of those who now enjoy the vote absent from

the voters' list. The qualification is so very low that every man could at once attain it if he was desirous of doing so. Then the franchise is extended to fishermen and their sons, and every provision seems to me to be made that the people shall be well and fully represented in the House of Commons. If it were a question affecting the rights of the province—if for instance it was going to deprive Prince Edward Island of a representative in the House of Commons it would be a totally different question. But that province is not deprived of any right; it will be represented by the same number under the operation of this Bill as it is to-day, so that the province is not injured in any way; its interests will be as fully guarded under this Bill as under the existing law. I certainly think the framers of the Confederation Act contemplated that a bill of this kind would be introduced at an early date in the history of the Dominion. The very language they used implies that such an idea was in their mind at the time, and it seems to me to be a natural and necessary thing that the Dominion Parliament should have the right of determining the franchise upon which its members are to be elected. For instance, if Ontario thought fit under the impulse of excessive liberality to give universal suffrage to its people, would not the other provinces have a right to complain of the basis on which that province was represented in the Dominion Parliament? I think we ought not to be exposed to a contingency of that kind. It might be done on a mere whim one year, and the next they might again change the franchise so that there would be no stability or fairness in their representation. There was another objection made by my hon. friend —I do not know whether it was under misapprehension—but he referred to the sending of a revising barrister from Ottawa down to his province. Now the Act itself clearly and distinctly provides that that could never be, that the revising barrister must be a person residing in the Province in which he is to act. At this late hour of the evening, although I would like to add some further remarks on this bill I do not think it is expedient to do so.

HON. MR. O'DONOHOE—I do not rise for the purpose of speaking on the merits of the bill, but simply to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to that point which has just been adverted to—the sending of a barrister down to any province. Supposing a barrister who has had five years' practice in Ontario goes to reside in Nova Scotia or in any other province, should his five years' practice in the province he left not be a qualification to entitle him to act as a revising barrister in the locality to which he has removed, or does it disqualify him? I know very well, and I desire particularly to bring it to the notice of the hon. leader of this House, that in Manitoba, for instance, a very large number of the barristers there have gone up from this province. If they have had five years of practice in their profession in this province, should they be disqualified from being revising barristers in Manitoba because they have not had five years practice there? They are under this Act; but I do not think that such a result was contemplated by the framers of this Bill. Surely if a barrister has practised five years in any of the provinces he is qualified to be a revising barrister in any province in which he may choose to reside; but if you require in this bill that he must be five years practising in the province in which he is called upon to act as a revising barrister, you disqualify a very large number of barristers in Manitoba, as most of the barristers there are men who have gone from other provinces to practise their profession there. Very few of them have spent five years in Manitoba and under this Bill, unless a man has practised five years in that province, he cannot be a revising barrister.

HON. MR. POWER—Are they not admitted in Manitoba now?

HON. MR. O'DONHOE—Yes, but they must be five years practising at the bar in the province in which they are called upon to act as revising barristers, under section 13 of the Bill. I do not think it is very reasonable, and I do not think it is proper.

HON. MR. SMITH—The resident barrister ought to have the preference.

HON. MR. O'DONOHOE—It is not his residence, it is his five years' practice

that qualifies him. However, I am not going to make any ado about it any more than to perform the duty of bringing the matter under the notice of the leader of the Government.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think it is a very desirable clause of the Bill. I think we can find in every province barristers of five years' standing qualified for the duty.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I rise to a point of order, we are not on that amendment now; we are on another amendment.

THE SPEAKER—Very wide latitude is allowed on a debate of this kind.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think the revising barrister should have some local knowledge, and he should have a certain term of residence before he acquires that local knowledge and is qualified for the office. The hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island opposed this clause of the Bill on the ground that the revising barrister might be taken from any other province. The Bill provides that he cannot be taken from any other province. I am surprised that those gentlemen who are in favor of universal suffrage should be opposed to this Bill. It is clear to my mind that no man is disfranchised by it. Even in Prince Edward Island it is only a sentiment. The right of franchise does not descend from father to son, and it should not descend in that way in perpetuity. No man in any part of the Dominion of Canada who ought to have a vote is deprived of it under this Bill.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—The hon. gentleman from Amherst, made a statement which was re-echoed by several other gentlemen, and in answering him I shall also answer them. He spoke of the Nova Scotia franchise as one which had existed only for six or seven years, whereas the present franchise in Prince Edward Island must have existed three or four times that length of time. The hon. gentleman spoke of the right of voting not being transmissible from father to son. But is that doctrine consistent with historical facts? Has not permanence been an important factor in all great struggles for freedom? I say that the very essence of our liberties is that it shall descend from father to son, and that they transmitted the liberties which they won for themselves from father to son from the remotest generation to our own time; and that when at any time they relaxed their vigilance, or allowed any power to encroach upon their liberties, in that way they lost them, and in that way the miserable state in which the municipalities of England existed up to the year 1835 or 1836 is accounted for. It was from this very remissness of the people, and remissness of their representatives in not faithfully guarding their rights and privileges that this loss of liberty occurred. And how am I or how is any gentlemen who represents Prince Edward Island to meet the people of our province face to face and admit to them that we have allowed those liberties of theirs to slip away from them without making a protest against it and attempting to preserve them faithfully? I will not lay myself open to any such imputation. I have before stood up in my place to advocate the liberties of my people, and although ten years have elapsed since that occasion, and my hairs have grown from gray to white, and my frame becomes more feeble, still I thank God that I have voice and strength enough yet to stand up in my place and defend the liberties of the people of my province. Have hon. gentlemen ever thought—has it occurred to them, or have they forgotten what occurred in the history of our cousins and neighbors in the United States? Did they not struggle most manfully against the first attempt of the British to impose taxes upon them? Everybody knows the history of those times, and some gentlemen will here recollect the words of our great English statesman Lord Chatham. They are noble words, and the people of whom they were spoken fully deserved them. I think also that my own people fully deserve credit for their care and zeal, and the manner in which they have guarded the liberties they possess. What did Lord Chatham say of the conduct of the Americans in resisting the encroachment of the British Parliament, or rather of the British sovereign, on their liberties? Because those enroachments made upon the

liberties of the people of America were encroachments made by a Parliament subservient to the sovereign power—a subserviency obtained by all sorts of illicit means, and surely we cannot but protest strongly against the introduction of the thin end of the wedge in this country. Lord Chatham says, "The spirit which now resists taxation in America is the same spirit which in England formerly opposed the loans, benevolences, and ship money." I hope and believe that that same spirit exists among the people of Prince Edward Island this day, and long may it continue there. Some hon. gentlemen have spoken of how we would act if this were a question of the liberties of the provinces, and if it were a question affecting a province, depriving it of any rights. In that I see the same identical disregard for the liberties of the people which lost to our British ancestors those liberties which they inherited from their Anglo-Saxon forefathers. I say this argument is altogether inconsistent with the preservation of our municipal and provincial institutions. Some reference has been made to the action of this House some ten years ago—on an occasion in some respects similar—and I think some little misapprehension prevails in regard to it. That was not an attempt at any permanent enroachment upon the liberties of the people of Prince Edward Island; it was a temporary arrangement proposed until the Local Government, too, should establish registration courts there which up to that time had no existence. It need not necessarily have occupied more than a year at the outside. The Local Legislature was not in session, and nine or ten months must necessarily have elapsed before it could have framed and passed a measure to establish registration courts. During that time the liberties of the people would have been in abeyance, and it is for that very reason that I opposed the bill, and used my very best influence to prevent it from becoming law, and successfully. And I did so on this principle, that if once you allow the abrogation of your liberties or of any privileges you possess, by any power whatsoever, you abandon the tenure on which they are held. It is that very carelessness that leads to the loss of liberty. Any one who will take the trouble to read up this question will find that it is by that very means, adopted by tyrannical sovereigns, in other countries besides our own, that the rights of the people have been invaded. When once our liberties are enroached on it is difficult to re-establish them. Let anyone take up the history of the Netherlands and read the struggle which the people of that region went through in order to obtain their municipal privileges; let them study the history of that country under Philip II., and observe how the privileges of of the people were abrogated by that sovereign. Let them read the history of England and see how in the days of the Stuarts our municipal liberties were often infringed upon, abrogated and forfeited to the Crown, and new franchises granted, granted not to those who held them before, but to others who were known to be subservient to the Royal interests. These are the dangers which we have to contend against. Of course, we here in Canada do not anticipate such extreme dangers as that; but are there no other dangers that the dominant party in Canada should by means of this bill, and through such bills as have passed through Parliament, become a permanent majority, and thus an oligarchy would become established in this Dominion of ours? Is there any danger of that in this Dominion? If hon. gentlemen think not, let them pass this bill; but I hope there is sufficient independence in this House yet to save the franchise for the people of Prince Edward Island. I will not detain the House any further by any unnecessary remarks.

The House divided on the amendment, which was lost on the following division:

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Baillargeon,	O'Donohoe,
Bellerose,	Paquet,
Guévremont,	Pelletier,
Haythorne,	Power,
Howlan,	Scott,
Leonard,	Stevens,
McClelan,	Wark.—15.
McInnes,	

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Allan,	McKindsey,
Bolduc,	McMillan,
Boucherville de,	Macdonald,
Campbell (Sir Alex.)	MacInnes,

Carvell,	Miller (Speaker),
Clemow,	Montgomery,
DeBlois,	Nelson,
Dever,	Northwood,
Dickey,	Plumb,
Girard,	Poirier,
Gowan,	Read,
Hamilton,	Smith,
Kaulbach,	Sutherland,
McDonald,	Vidal.—29
McKay,	

HON. MR. SCOTT moved in amendment :

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be amended by striking out the words, "In the Provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island," in the 9th section, and by inserting in lieu thereof the words, "In all the Provinces of the Dominion."

He said—It has been conceded that it is a sound principle that where free men have had the right to vote it is unwise to take away from them that privilege. That principle has been extended to British Columbia and Prince Edward Island where those who are now on the list will have the right to vote. If it is a sound principle in British Columbia and Prince Edward Island where practically manhood suffrage exists, how much sounder is the principle when applied to parties who now have the right to vote on a qualification, and which right will be taken away from them by this Bill? Now, I am asking the same privilege for these that has been conceded to the people of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia. It does not disturb the Bill in the slightest particular; but in case there are in the other provinces of the Dominion some persons who will not be entitled to vote under this Bill, and who have at present a vote, that such parties shall not be deprived of the franchise. In Ontario, it is conceded that there are some who are now entitled to vote who will be disfranchised under this Bill.

The House divided on the amendment which was lost on the following division :—

CONTENTS :

Hon. Messrs.

Baillargeon,	Paquet,
Chaffers,	Pelletier,
Haythorne,	Power,
Leonard,	Scott,
McClelan,	Stevens,
McInnes (B.C.),	Wark.—12.

NON-CONTENTS :

Hon. Messrs.

Allan,	McKindsey,
Bolduc,	McMillan,
Boucherville, de,	Macdonald (B.C.),
Campbell (Sir Alex.),	MacInnes(Burlington),
Carvell,	Miller (Speaker),
Clemow,	Montgomery,
DeBlois,	Nelson,
Dever,	Northwood,
Dickey,	O'Donohoe,
Girard,	Plumb,
Gowan,	Poirier,
Hamilton,	Read,
Howlan,	Smith,
Kaulbach,	Sutherland,
McDonald (C.B.),	Vidal.—31.
McKay,	

HON. MR. BELLEROSE moved in mendment :

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending the same by inserting after the fourth clause the following :—

"Notwithstanding the provisions contained in the third and in the fourth clauses of this Act, which will have no effect in the Province of Quebec, from and after the first day of January, in the year of Our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six, in this said Province of Quebec, every person who at the time of the passing of this Act is entitled to vote in this Province by the laws at present existing in the same, shall have a right to be registered as a voter and to vote so long as he shall continue to be qualified to vote under the provisions of the said last mentioned laws and no longer."

He said—In moving this amendment I hope the House will not forget that I have asked for the Province of Quebec only that it be put on the same footing as, under the Confederation Act, it has been placed in its representation in the Senate. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the 22nd clause of the British North America Act they will see that the Province of Quebec is represented in the Senate in an exceptional way. While Senators from other provinces are appointed for the province, in Quebec Senators are appointed for electoral divisions, and they are obliged to own a property qualification in the electoral divisions which they represent. As I said the other day, although my argument was misunderstood, it showed that it was the intention of the framers of the constitution that Quebec should stand as an exception in regard to representation, and I say so now. I voted with pleasure a few moments

ago to leave to another province the privilege which she now enjoys, and I hope the House will grant to Quebec that to which she seems to be entitled under the Confederation Act, and seems to have been specially reserved to her according to my interpretation of the constitution.

The House divided on the amendment, which was lost on the following division :—

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Armand,	McClelan,
Baillargeon,	McInnes (B.C.),
Bellerose,	Pâquet,
Boucherville, de	Pelletier,
Chaffers,	Power,
Guévremont,	Scott,
Haythorne,	Stevens,
Leonard,	Trudel.—16.

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Allan,	McMillan,
Campbell (Sir Alex.),	McDonald (B.C.),
Carvell,	McInnes (Burlington),
Clemow,	Miller (Speaker),
DeBlois,	Montgomery,
Dever,	Nelson,
Dickey,	Northwood,
Girard,	O'Donohoe,
Gowan,	Plumb,
Hamilton,	Poirier,
Howlan,	Read,
Kaulbach,	Smith,
Macdonald (C.B.),	Sutherland,
McKay,	Vidal.—29.
McKindsey,	

HON. MR. BELLEROSE moved in amendment

That the said Bill be not now read a third time but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending the same so that the voters' list in the different provinces shall be prepared by an officer chosen by the Federal Government for that purpose from amongst the residents of such electoral division in the Dominion and revised by a Commission of three competent individuals also resident in the County or electoral division and to be chosen by one of the Judges of a Superior Court in each Province.

The motion was declared lost on a division.

HON. MR. POWER—I have an amendment to propose to the Bill which I hope will meet the approval of a majority of the House. It is as follows :—

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of striking out the paragraph in the second clause which defines the word "person" and inserting instead thereof the following :—"Person means a male person including an Indian not being an un-nfranchised tribal Indian."

And also of striking out sub-clause (C) of clause 11.

I may be allowed to explain the effect of that. The paragraph which defines "person" is as follows :—"Person means a male person, including an Indian and excluding a person of Mongolian or Chinese race." The effect of the amendment is to allow a Chinaman who has become a naturalized citizen to vote. None but native born or naturalized subjects are recognized in this Bill, and any Chinaman who has become naturalized and possesses the necessary property qualification would, under this amendment, possess the franchise. I think that is a proposition which will meet with the approbation of the majority of the Senate. The amendment also puts the Indian in the same position as the white man, if he lives the same as a white man, and pays taxes, and can make contracts like a white man.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—Would the hon. gentleman have any objection to dividing his motion into two?

HON. MR. POWER—Not the slightest.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—The hon. Member is willing to divide his motion but he cannot do so without the consent of the House. If the House will permit it to be divided I think that would be the better way.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It would be better for my hon. friend to move a second amendment defining his own view.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—There is one portion of the amendment for which I would vote ; the other I have not studied.

THE SPEAKER—The House does not consent to a division of the amendment.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—Then I beg to move in amendment to the amendment that the words after "an Indian" in the 3rd and 4th lines, page 2, be stricken out.

The Senate divided on the amendment which was rejected by the following vote:

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Armand,	Chaffers,
Baillargeon,	Guévremont,
Bellerose,	Trudel,
Boucherville, de	Vidal.—8.

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon Messrs.

Allan,	McKindsey,
Campbell (Sir Alex),	McMillan,
Carvell,	Macdonald (B.C.),
Clemow,	MacInnes (Burlington)
DeBlois,	Miller (Speaker),
Dever,	Montgomery,
Dickey,	Nelson,
Girard,	Northwood,
Gowan,	O'Donohoe,
Hamilton,	Plumb,
Howlan,	Poirier,
Kaulbach,	Read,
McDonald (C.B.),	Smith,
McInnes (B.C.),	Sutherland.—29.
McKay,	

The Senate divided on the motion in amendment to the main motion, which was rejected by the following vote:—

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Armand,	McClelan,
Baillargeon,	Pâquet,
Bellerose,	Pelletier,
Boucherville, de,	Power,
Chaffers,	Scott,
Haythorne,	Stevens.—13.
Leonard,	

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Allan,	McMillan,
Campbell (Sir Alex.),	Macdonald (B.C.),
Carvell,	MacInnes (Burlington)
Clemow,	Miller (Speaker),
DeBlois,	Montgomery,
Dever,	Nelson,
Dickey,	Northwood,
Girard,	O'Donohoe,
Gowan,	Plumb,
Hamilton,	Poirier,
Howlan,	Read,
Kaulbach,	Smith,
McDonald (C.B.),	Sutherland,
McInnes (B.C.),	Trudel,
McKay,	Vidal.—31.
McKindsey,	

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE moved

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be amended by inserting the words "unless he be a Christian" after the word "race" in the fourth line, page 2.

He said—I do not think there is any nation of barbarians, as we call them, who refuse the right of citizenship to those who adopt their religion. We have sent missionaries to China, and although hon. members say that very few of the Chinese have been converted to the Christian religion, I think the hon. member from Sarnia has shown that there are quite a number of Christian Chinamen. I have certainly seen lately, on good authority, that the Christian religion has made great progress in China. Now supposing those men to whom we have said "Adore our God and be our brethren," should come to this country are we to tell them "although you are Christians and profess the same faith as we do, you will be in a lower position here than the slave occupied some years ago in the United States—lower than the slave occupies at this day in some parts of the Western Hemisphere?" It is unnecessary to say any more on this subject; a Christian who is a British subject and possesses the qualifications prescribed in this Bill ought to be an elector.

The Senate divided on the amendment, which was rejected on the following vote:

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Armand,	O'Donohoe,
Baillargeon,	Pâquet,
Bellerose,	Pelletier,
Boucherville, de,	Poirier,
Chaffers,	Power,
DeBlois,	Scott,
Dickey,	Stevens,
Guévremont,	Trudel,
Haythorne,	Vidal,
Leonard,	Wark.—21.
McClelan,	

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Allan,	McKindsey,
Campbell,	McMillan,
(Sir Alexander),	Macdonald (B.C.),
Carvell,	MacInnes
Clemow,	(Burlington),
Dever,	Miller (Speaker),
Girard,	Montgomery,
Gowan,	Nelson,

Hamilton,
Howlan,
Kaulbach,
McDonald (C.B.),
McInnes (B.C.),
McKay,
Northwood,
Plumb,
Read,
Smith,
Sutherland.—25.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I desire to say before the Bill is read the third time that I have been requested by the hon. member for DeSalaberry to propose an amendment respecting Judges of the Session of the Peace, Recorders and Stipendiary Magistrates, so that they may be revising officers. I consulted the Premier and another of my colleagues, and I have mentioned the matter to my hon. friend from DeSalaberry. They think, with reference to two of the officials mentioned, that there is no necessity for an amendment, inasmuch as they are generally barristers of five years standing, and therefore there is no occasion to alter the Bill in the manner proposed. My hon. friend also desires that the Bill should be changed so as to admit barristers of three years standing instead of five.

HON. MR. POWER—No, no.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think, myself, that it would not be an improvement. My hon. friend however, made the suggestion to me, and I thought I should mention it on the third reading of the Bill.

The main motion was agreed to on a division, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

The Senate adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Wednesday, July 15th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPLETION BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (153), "An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to provide for the completion and successful operation thereof."

In the Committee on the 10th clause.

HON. MR. POWER—Before this clause is adopted I should like the Minister of Justice to put in plain English the meaning of it, for it seems rather hard to follow and to tell exactly what the meaning of it is as it now stands.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The meaning of the clause, as it now stands, is that this Algoma Branch runs only part of the way to Sault St. Marie. There is in contemplation the constructing of a line from Minneapolis and St. Paul to Sault St. Marie, and if that line is continued to the Sault, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company extend their line up from Algoma to the Sault, the Algoma branch may be mortgaged, notwithstanding this Bill, for the purpose of raising money to make the connection at the Sault.

HON. MR. POWER—I understand that while the Algoma branch remains in its present condition, the mortgage is the first lien on it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

HON. MR. POWER—But if there is a prospect of the road becoming valuable then the Government will be prepared to relinquish their lien upon it and allow the company to mortgage the whole Algoma branch to other parties to raise money, and the Government lien will come in merely as a second mortgage.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not think my hon. friend should draw the conclusion that the Government is to do so; the Government has power to do so under this bill, and my hon. friend must

bear in mind that the money so raised is to be applied on the road.

HON. MR. POWER—But there is the position; that while the Algoma branch is of no great value, the Government hold the first lien on it. If such circumstances as the Minister of Justice indicates take place, the road will then become of great value because if the connection which is spoken of is made, the branch from Sault St. Marie to Sudbury will be the most valuable portion of the Pacific Railway, and then the country will have only a second mortgage on that road when it becomes valuable.

HON. MR. MCMILLAN—It is better than a first mortgage on a road which is good for nothing.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL.—The money that will be raised will be spent upon the road.

HON. MR. POWER—I am not saying this of the present more than of any other administration, but a Government, dealing with a corporation like the Pacific Railway Company, is always at a disadvantage. The representations of the directors are hard to resist, and there is generally no one present who is interested in opposing those representations and solicitations; so I take it that saying that "the Governor in Council may in his discretion," is practically equivalent to saying that "the Governor in Council shall," and I think it is an objectionable provision. As regards that Algoma branch, my impression is that it would really be better for the Government to advance a little money themselves than to give up their lien on the road, because there is no portion of the Pacific Railway which will be better security for money advanced on it than that section. There is nothing said in this Bill to prevent the company from going outside of the provisions of their charter, and there is an amendment which I think is desirable should be moved as to the western terminus of the road. I suppose it is not necessary to give notice of the amendment now, but if it is, I give notice that I am prepared, when the Bill is at its third reading, to move an amendment with respect to the western terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It is quite reasonable, if this Algoma Branch is now, in its incomplete state, comparatively worthless, as my hon. friend admits it is, that anyone advancing money upon it to make it valuable should have a first lien for money so advanced. Those who make it valuable should have some right to get their money back.

HON. MR. POWER—An unfinished road, as a rule, is not very valuable.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B.C.)—Before this Bill is reported, I desire to move that the following clause be added to the Bill:—

Clause A.

"In case the company, by any extension of its main line, or by the construction of any branch line or lines, or by any agreement for acquiring or leasing the line or lines of any other railway company or companies, or by any agreement for running powers over the line or lines of any other railway company or companies, or by traffic arrangements with any other railway company or companies, or by any other means or device, establish (or purpose to establish) a Terminus on the Pacific coast at any point other than Port Moody, then the Government of Canada shall not construct or establish any such terminus, nor along the line or lines of railway (whereby the Canadian Pacific Railway is connected or proposed to be connected with such terminus,) the engine house, station buildings, and water service, which, by contract and agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company approved and ratified by the Act passed in the Forty-Fourth year of Her Majesty's Reign, Chapter One, the Government is bound to construct, establish and convey to the company, upon the completion of the Eastern and Central Section of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but the said engine house, station buildings and water service shall be constructed and established at Port Moody, notwithstanding the establishment, or proposed establishment, of any other terminus."

This is the amendment that I gave notice of some days ago when I was discussing the terminus question, but before entering upon the merits of it to-day I desire to make a personal explanation which slipped my memory upon that occasion. My hon. friend from Lunenburg and myself, have been accused of speculating in Port Moody property, and in consequence of

that speculation that our minds were more or less biased. It is quite true that my hon. friend from Lunenburg and myself have speculated there. I regret to say that we have, but I have only to acquaint this House with the fact that we did not do so until we had the most positive assurances—private as well as public—public announcements and declarations from the Government, that Port Moody was the terminus and would remain the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But if my hon. friend and myself have speculated there we have done so with our own moneys. We did not come to the Government and ask them for a loan of over three quarters of a million as the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. are doing at the present time, asking for $760,000 for private speculation. I claim that the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. have no more right to ask this Government for $760,000 to further their own private interests that are wholly and solely apart from the Canadian Pacific Railway than we have. It has not been denied by the Minister of Justice, or by the Premier, or by the acting Minister of Railways, or by the late Minister of Railways, that Port Moody is all that can be desired as a terminus for a great transcontinental railway. It is not on any ground of inefficiency, or want of space, or want of good anchorage, or any facilities necessary for the terminus of a great transcontinental railway that another terminus has been selected. At Port Moody there are no less than ten miles of the finest anchorage and dockage that could be found in any harbor, I do not hesitate to say, in the world. Vessels can lie along the shore there without even casting out an anchor, so secure is that place and so well protected from any winds—it is perfectly land-locked.

In confirmation of that, I will read a short article that came under my notice to-day. It is as follows :—

While the estimates were passing through the House the following discussion took place, at the instance of Mr. Blake, on the item of—

"For connection with Coal Harbor and English Bay, shops, buildings, docks, tracks and other facilities at Pacific terminus, $760,000."

The hon. gentleman said:—The Government told the House very strongly, and no longer ago than last session—yes, and even this session, when I called the attention of the acting Minister to the fact that there were rumors that the company were prosecuting the extension from Port Moody to Coal Harbor or English Bay, and pointed out that I had indicated before that, for the China and Japan trade, something of that kind would be done—he said: If it is done, the Government considers Port Moody the proper point, and if anything more is done it will be by the company itself, and we have no concern with it whatever; and at that moment he was making a contract for the additional expenditure of no less than $70,000 to put down iron piles instead of the wooden piles in front of Port Moody wharf, which, if this arrangement is to be made, will be a structure little required. I do not mean to say there will be no traffic at Port Moody: but, if the terminus is to be some thirteen miles off, at Coal Harbor or English Bay, we have made a permanent structure at Port Moody to repair the ravages of the teredo, costing more than the wharf cost altogether, and in addition to giving that to the Pacific Railway we are to find means of borrowing, and perhaps are ourselves to give them, $760,000 for this extension. The Minister of Railways, early in the session, said: This is a matter with which we had no concern; it is not our business; we believe the terminus at Port Moody is adequate. I want to know whether the Government have any further information on this subject, whether they have approved of this as necessary and important to the company, and whether they have verified at all the estimates and plans upon which the Canadian Pacific Railway terminus is to be transferred, in fact, from Port Moody to Coal Harbor or English Bay.

Now, I will read the reply of the Premier :

Sir John A. Macdonald—As I understand, these estimates are generally rough estimates, but before the money can be expended full details will be given. As to the connection with Coal Harbor, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways was quite right in stating that it was the affair of the company itself. Under the contract and the Act of Parliament the terminus was stated to be at Port Moody, as far as the Government was concerned; the contract ends there, and it is a fine harbor, no doubt, and will always have a considerable amount of trade, I fancy, which will still remain and start from Port Moody, although it is the intention of the company to extend the line to Coal Harbor and English Bay. It appears, on fuller investigation, that the interests of the company and the interests of foreign trade will be promoted by going to Coal Harbor and English Bay, but it forms no portion of the contract, and they get no portion of the subsidy on this part of the line. I believe the extension of the road has been made for the advantage of the general Asiatic trade. You may depend upon it that the

company, with the evidence they have before them, are acting in the best interests of trade and of their railway in going to the expense of extending it 13 miles further.

I would say, in reply to that statement of the right hon. gentleman, that it is highly misleading, to say the least of it. In the first place, I would not attempt to say anything against the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any private company, extending that road beyond Port Moody if they were doing so at their own cost, as we are led to believe they are, and I am sorry to say that the Minister of Justice about a week ago gave this House to understand that it was out of their own money.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is so.

HON. MR. McINNES—The leader of the House says that it is their own money. You have already had the annual report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company signed by Mr. Stephens the president. After giving a general explanation of the condition of the road, he winds up as follows :—

"All the various needs of a new railway in a new and rapidly growing country, and everything necessary to secure economical and efficient operation, and the full development and permanent control of its traffic, must be supplied.

For these purposes, the estimated amount required will be as follows:—

For sleeping cars, passenger cars, dining cars, baggage, mail and express cars, emigrant cars, box and cattle cars, conductors' cars, derrick, tool and other auxiliary cars, locomotives, hand cars, push cars, track tools, semaphores and other equipment requisite for operation of line, also for restoring construction locomotives to good working condition	$1,000,000
For elevators at Port Arthur, Fort William, Montreal, etc.; coal-bunkers, Montreal; additional real estate Montreal and elsewhere; revetment walls at Montreal; additional depots and tracks and other facilities, Montreal and other points; additional yard room and tracks, coal and other docks, and other terminal facilities at Fort William and Port Arthur	1,500,000
For divisional shops and machinery at nine points, coal docks and machinery at two points on Lake Superior section; station buildings, section houses and miscellaneous buildings at various points; additional station sidings and crossing tracks at various points; extension of divisional yards; additional engine houses; improvement in water supply; additional tanks; permanent bridge work at the various crossings of Bow River and on other sections; additional ballasting, filling trestles and raising roadway	600,000
For completion of telegraph system, main line and branches.	275,000
For connection with Coal Harbor and English Bay; shops, buildings, docks, tracks and other facilities at Pacific terminus	760,000
Contingent expenditures	910,000
	$5,045,000

That is a portion of the $5,000,000 that we are asked to grant this company in the Bill before the House. (No, no.)

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend is quite mistaken. The $5,000,000, are already spent. It is the floating debt that we are going to meet with the $5,000,000. This is a statement put in by the company to show what the necessities of the road are, and to explain to the country that the road is by no means finished, although the contract is nearly completed—that there are a great many things to be done needing an expenditure of money, and they put that before the country to show that a large amount of money will yet have to be expended, but they are not going to spend the public money, but their own.

HON. MR. McINNES—Although I am not a lawyer or versed in the law, I say by common sense (and I hope I have common sense and understand the English language sufficiently to see on the face of it what is meant by it)—

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend does not understand it then.

HON. MR. McINNES—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I do. What is the title of the Bill before us: "An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the

Canadian Pacific Railway, and to provide for the completion and successful operation thereof." What does the President of the Company say? Does he not say that it is necessary that those sums of money shall be spent in order to provide for the completion and successful operation of the road? It is as clear to me as possible, and I am really astonished that any person can accept, or put, any con struction upon it but that. I divest myself of everything in the shape of selfishness in the matter, and I believe that three-fourths of the whole country will put that construction upon it. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have money of their own to build that road, I ask why they are coming here for $5,000,000 for that purpose?

HON. MR. PLUMB—They are not asking us to give it.

HON. MR. MCINNES—They certainly are. Why do they put in that Bill if they do not ask for it?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—They borrow it and agree to return it next year—in July.

HON. MR. MCINNES—Yes, it will be returned in all probability as quickly as the money granted to the Grand Trunk Railway. We have $30,000,000 there, and it is likely to remain there for all time. I do not want to decry the company, or have that charge laid to me, but I am as confident as I am that I stand here that this country will never see one dollar of the advance which has been made to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, including that $5,000,000, paid back. We are giving it to them as a gift; they are not a company, they are merely contractors for the Government, and I believe now is the time for the Government to take possession of the Canadian Pacific Railway, complete, equip and run it in the interests of the country. Now is the time, because it is only a few months, in my opinion, until it will be compelled to do it anyway.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—Will the hon. gentleman refer to section 7 of the bill?

HON. MR. MCINNES—I have read that bill very carefully, and my hon. friend may be looking through one pair of spectacles and I am looking through another pair, and those I am looking through suit me remarkably well.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—They are not green I hope.

HON. MR. MCINNES—In moving this resolution I am asking for nothing but fair play and common justice that ought to be accorded to me and that ought to be accorded to those who have been misled: and I expect that this House will give that measure of justice that is due to them. Take this contract that was entered into, and as the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the other House, stated in that branch of the legislature, the Act and the contract entered into with the Pacific Railway Company make provision that those terminal works that I ask for shall be erected at Port Moody. What does it say in the 10th clause of the contract?

"In further consideration of the premises the Government shall also grant to the company the lands required for the road-bed of the railway, and for its stations, station-grounds, workshops, dock ground, and water frontage at the termini or navigable waters, buildings, yards and other appurtenances required for the convenient and effectual construction and working of the railway, in so far as such land shall be vested in the Government."

The Government do not dispute that they selected Port Moody as the terminus, years ago, and that they have gone on leading the public to believe that it would be equipped with the public buildings necessary for a great railway terminus. I have been accused of quarreling with the Government because the company were going to extend the line beyond Port Moody. I have no desire to quarrel with the Government, and much less with any member of this House. I do not think I can be fairly charged with being a quarrelsome person; but while I take that position I consider that I would be unworthy of being a member of this House, or of being one of its three representatives from the Province of British Columbia, unless I stood up in my place and raised my voice in defence of those who have been misled—those who have been wronged,

grossly wronged, if the vile scheme of this extension is carried out. The position that I stand in to-day is this: hundreds have interviewed me, and I have received letters from parties that I never saw asking me "Is Port Moody the terminus of the Pacific Railway?" "Is it a safe place to invest our means in?" I invariably referred them to the solemn announcement made by Sir Charles Tupper and the Government, that Port Moody was the terminus. I said, "I can give you that, and I think it is quite sufficient; but in addition to that I am safe in saying that I have the most positive private evidence that Port Moody is the terminus." On the strength of that assurance they invested their money, some of them their all, and hon. gentlemen can understand the position that I am in. They no doubt look to me as the person who misled them, or to a certain extent misled them in investing their means there. That is the false position that I am in. That is the false position that the Government of the country has placed me in, and all those who have invested at Port Moody. We are told that it was only when Mr. Van Horne came to this country that they discovered that Port Moody was not quite as good a harbor as the Pacific railway people would like it to be. Notwithstanding the speech of Sir Charles Tupper which I quoted here about a week ago—and that speech was not giving his own views merely, but the views of the highest naval authorities that had visited those waters on the Pacific coast, extending over a period of 25 years—notwithstanding all that, when Mr. Van Horne comes over here he goes out to Burrard Inlet, to Port Moody and English Bay, for five or six hours, and he, with his would-be all-seeing eye, could detect at a glance that these authorities are all wrong, that Port Moody is not a good harbor, that Coal Harbor is a little better, and that English Bay, exposed as it is to the prevailing winds and tides, is the best. In connection with this I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Minister of Justice, in replying to my observation the other day, forgot to mention anything about the enormous amount of money required to build a breakwater to make English Bay anything like fit for vessels to anchor in safety there. He entirely overlooked that—the two or three millions stated by Sir Charles Tupper that it would cost for that purpose.

HON. MR. CARVELL—If the hon. gentleman will allow me, perhaps I will help him in his argument. It has been said that the Pacific Railway Company had intended to place their buildings there and make the improvements, as suggested by the words he has read, but that on going there they found that speculators had preceded them and bought the lands and asked exorbitant prices from the Company for them. I would suggest that to the hon. gentleman in order, if it is not so, that he may contradict it.

HON. MR. McINNES—I am very glad the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island has mentioned that matter. I do not know whether he was in the House the other day when I was dealing with that portion of the question. I stated that last November, property owners at Port Moody had offered the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. 450 acres of land within a mile and a half of the head of Port Moody—offered it as a gift. Not only that, but to show the liberality and fairmindedness of that people, they offered to give one-third of all their private property within one mile of Port Moody, if the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. would keep the terminus at Port Moody for 20 years, so that that statement is not correct. I have also heard it stated, in that connection, that the company could not find enough of level land there for their terminal works, and all that kind of nonsense. There is a stretch of country from the head of Port Moody up to Pitt River, a distance of five miles, of level land.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Up stream?

HON. MR. McINNES—Yes, up stream. There is a fall of eight or ten feet in five miles, so that the grades are not very steep. I think they are a little steeper than that in the Selkirk range.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Is there not a Government reservation there?

HON. MR. McINNES—Yes, there are two military reservations a little west of

Port Moody. What did the Government do five or six years ago? As I said the other day, they reserved nearly a mile and a quarter of the best water frontage at Port Moody, and a considerable amount of land adjoining it. What was that reserved for? The ground was levelled, the trees were felled, and stumps grubbed out, and all was prepared for the erection of those terminal works. That work was going on until the middle of May last. I think it is a poor state of affairs, hon. gentlemen, if we cannot find men enough in our own country to, at least, acquire sufficient knowledge of the country, and the requirements for the terminus of a great road like that. It has also been stated, I believe, by certain interested parties that Port Moody is a small harbor. It is not a very large harbor, but it is four miles in length, with an average of one-half to three-quarters of a mile in width. We have ten miles of as good anchorage and dockage there as can be found in the world. I think that is quite ample for the Pacific Railway for the next 50 or 100 years. They claim that they require a large amount of dockage for the Asiatic trade. What is the great Asiatic trade that the Premier refers to here that it is necessary to extend the road down to English Bay to accommodate? In San Francisco, where they have the terminus of the Central Pacific Railway as well as the Southern Pacific, there is only one Asiatic steamship coming in there every two weeks, and if it is for the Asiatic trade I would like to ask what difference it would make for a ship after coming five or six or eight thousand miles, to go twelve miles along as fine a stretch of inland navigation as is to be found anywhere, at the end of a journey of that length? Of course they would go to the perfect harbor of Port Moody instead of anchoring in an open roadstead like English Bay.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD—Do you count the sailing ships coming from China to San Francisco?

Hon. Mr. McINNES—I am not counting sailing ships, but if you have reference to all the shipping coming into San Francisco I will leave it to the hon. gentleman's own judgment to say if he has ever seen more than 50 ships in San Francisco Harbor and Bay at one time?

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD—That is a large number.

Hon. Mr. McINNES—It is a large number, but San Francisco is an old place with a large trade and population, with four times the entire population of British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD—I never saw that number in Liverpool at one time.

Hon. Mr. McINNES—I do not say that I have ever seen that number in San Francisco myself at one time, but I am asking the hon. gentleman if he has ever seen that number there at one time.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD—I have not.

Hon. Mr. McINNES—Well, then, it is not necessary that that road should be extended in order to meet this great trade that is going to spring up, on the completion of the Pacific Railway, between this country and Asia. I am sorry to say that I have no faith whatever in that trade. It will scarcely amount to anything, and I will give you my reason for thinking so. As I said before, the Southern and the Central Pacific Railways run to San Francisco. They have been in existence for a number of years, and if they could not attract a greater amount of trade than would warrant more than one steamship in two weeks, are we with our population of 5,000,000, going to attract more trade than the 55,000,000 in the country to the south of us? I do not think it is reasonable to suppose that we will. Then, there is the Northern Pacific, only 100 miles in a direct line south of the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Is there any line of steamers running in connection with that road to any distant foreign country? No. For these reasons I am sorry to think that the Asiatic trade is more imaginary than anything else. Should the Canadian Pacific Railway obtain all the Asiatic trade, it would not amount to two car loads a day. I had a very delicate compliment paid me a day or two ago in this House. The Minister of Justice stated that there was no sense

in asking for the erection of the engine house and other terminal buildings at Port Moody. I do not claim to have any more common sense, probably, than is necessary, but I think if I were senseless in asking that the Syndicate and the Government should carry out what they solemnly agreed to in 1881, surely there was no sense on the part of the Minister of Justice and the acting Minister of Railways going to work and calling for tenders for the erection of those houses at Port Moody up to the 24th May last. I say that if I were senseless in asking for that, I think the Government were a great deal more so, yes, dishonest, in calling for tenders for a work that they did not intend to build. There is another matter I wish to refer to, but I will defer it until the Minister of Justice is in his place. I showed most conclusively, when I was dealing with this subject a week ago, that if the road was extended to English Bay and Coal Harbor—that is, if we gave them the wherewithal to do it—the Dominion property in and around Port Moody would be depreciated to the extent of three or four millions of dollars. I believe if the terminus remains where it is, that the property which they own will be worth from $3,000,000 to $4,000,000 within the next five years. I think I also showed, not on my own statement, not on my own estimate, but giving as my authority the ex-Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, that it would cost from one to two millions of dollars for the erection of a breakwater or to make anything like a harbor of English Bay, so that there is a direct loss, for all of the money for the erection of a harbor must come out of the Dominion Treasury. That would be a direct loss to the Dominion of $5,000,000, a considerable sum, which ought to be applied towards recouping the vast amount that that road has already cost the country. The Minister of Justice is now in his place, and I will refer to the fact that he stated, a short time ago, his impression of Port Moody as a town site. I remember meeting that hon. gentleman at Port Moody. If my memory serves me right it was about two years ago. He stated that his impression of Port Moody was not a very favorable one: that he thought it was not a very suitable place for a large town. I will take the liberty of asking the hon. gentleman two or three questions, which I hope he will condescend to answer. In the first place I ask him how long did he remain at Port Moody?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Perhaps half an hour.

HON. MR. McINNES—How far did the hon. gentleman walk around Port Moody, or away from that wharf?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I did not walk at all. I was down at the wharf, and at the place where the hotel was.

HON. MR. McINNES—There was no road there?

HON SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There was no road from the wharf to where the hotel was.

HON. MR. McINNES—I would ask again how far could the hon. gentleman see in any direction from the wharf?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not remember how far I could see from the wharf. I remember that there was a great deal of fire in the woods, and the atmosphere was smoky. I could not see so far on that day as I could on some other days.

HON. MR. McINNES—I am very glad that the hon. gentleman has been so frank in his reply. I remember that day very well. The whole of the lower portion of British Columbia was enveloped in dense smoke, and I doubt very much, although I know my hon. friend's eyesight was pretty good, if he could on that day have seen as far as from here to Wellington St. It was impossible to see any distance owing to the dense smoke. The hon. gentleman acknowledges that he was only a few yards around the wharf, and that he saw a bluff. It is true that where the wharf is built it is immediately under a bluff from 50 to 75 feet high, and there is considerable of a hill beyond; but I think that was scarcely a sufficient amount of experience upon which to pronounce that Port Moody was not a fit place for a harbor, or a place fit for a large town.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have not pronounced that in any way. I said that was my impression.

HON. MR. MCINNES—I am very sorry that the hon. gentleman gave that impression to the House, that a large town could not be built there. As my hon. colleague on my left here knows well, there is an expanse at the head of Port Moody of about a mile, and then it gradually widens out to a valley of two miles until you go back five miles, and I do not think you could get a better place for a large city of half a million of a population than is to be found there. Immediately back of the first little bluff, which stands about a quarter of a mile from the water's edge, you attain an altitude of 100 or 200 feet. Then there is a level plateau extending all the way to the Fraser River a distance of about two and a-half miles. As I pointed out the other day, in connection with Coal Harbour, you cannot get a drop of pure water there. At Port Moody it is plentiful. I know of no place so bountifully supplied with pure water, as fine water as ever quenched any parched throat.

HON. MR MACDONALD—A good place for the Scott Act people.

HON. MR. MCINNES—Yes, but much better for the anti-Scott Act people, for they can get pure sparkling water there that would purify them from the impurities and abominations of alcohol.

HON. MR. POWER—I would suggest to my hon. friend that he is making a great mistake, if he wishes to interest the sympathies of the majority of this House, to say anything about alcohol. Alcohol is king here.

HON. MR. MCINNES—I am asking for no charity. I am pleading for nothing but simple justice, and I consider that I ought to get justice in this House ; if I do not get justice a great wrong will be done.

HON. MR. POWER—I am only suggesting that you would prejudice the jury a little if you say anything against alcohol in this House.

HON. MR. MCINNES—I do not wish to detain the House any longer, but there is one thing I wish to press upon the attention of hon. gentlemen, and that is, that we are asked to give $760,000 for the purpose of extending the Pacific Railway to Coal Harbor, and the incentive for the extension of that road is not to meet the Asiatic trade, that has been put forth as a plea ; but the incentive is to get 8,000 acres of land, 6,000 of which has been given by at least two members of the corrupt, land jobbing, local legislature of British Columbia.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. MCINNES—Yes, I say it, and I can prove it. I say that is the incentive; that is the reason why the vice President of the Pacific Railway thought it advisable to extend the road to English Bay. As I read a few days ago from the correspondence that passed between the Vice President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Local Legislature, when these negotiations were going on for the acquisition of the 6,000 acres of land, he requested the Local Government in making that over, to transfer it to trustees to be appointed by the company, and those trustees, are the Hon. D. A. Smith and Mr. Angus. Why do they want them made over to trustees? He goes on to explain—so that the lien attaching to the Canadian Pacific Railway would not apply to them. I say if we are to give them $760,000 for the extension of that road, is it anything more than fair that the road and lands should be included in the security this country should have on this road to save themselves?

HON. MR. MACDONALD — That would not do.

HON. MR. MCINNES—Not to serve their purpose, I am aware of that.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—They want to sell town lots, and if they were encumbered they could not dispose of them.

HON. MR. MCINNES—Yes, as I said the other day, they have six miles square

plotted out in beautiful maps, and that is to be put on the English market and the markets of the United States and Canada. They call the place Vancouver, a euphonius name, and it is to be the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is the Asiatic trade for which they want to extend that road down there. It is to make millions out of that, and as I pointed out the other day, if anything should occur to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which would compel the Government to take over the line they would draw the line at Port Moody and say, "gentlemen, west of that you have nothing to do; the extension is private property. It is true you gave us the money to extend the road and erect round houses and all that sort of thing, but it is our private property and you have no mortgage on it. We have got the money; you can go that far, but no farther." I consider that it is manifestly unfair if the road is to be extended, and if we grant the means for that extension, that the lien should not cover it. It is certainly the duty of Parliament to see that the Government take a mortgage on that portion of the road and land, and place it in the same position as the rest of the Canadian Pacific Railway line. But I claim that it is the bounden duty of the Government here to at least carry out their contract with the company. The original contract entered into with them included the terminal buildings. I ask this House to endorse the resolution I have moved. It does not interfere with the Government granting $5,000,000 relief that the company ask for. It merely asks the Government to erect the terminal buildings they promised to construct, and which are provided for in the contract, where the public were led to believe that they would be built—at the place where the people, acting upon the assurance that the terminus would be at Port Moody, went and invested their money. I ask that in all fairness. If the syndicate see fit to extend beyond that with their own means, or if the Government give them the means to do so, I claim it is the duty of the Government to erect the buildings at Port Moody, and keep faith with the people of this country. Yesterday I applauded the Minister of Justice—I could not help but applaud him—in one of his statements in reply to an amendment moved in the other House by Mr. Blake, to the effect that the syndicate ought to draw on the $14,000,000 now in the hands of the Government in order to complete the road. What was his reply? That it would be manifestly unfair and absurd (and a great many other hard expressions he made use of) to expect the company to break faith with those who had taken stock in the Canadian Pacific Railway. I could not help but admire the spirit of justice and fair play that he displayed, and his burning desire to protect the honor and faith of his country and keep faith with foreigners. But if such is the case with foreigners, I ask have not the people of Canada as great a right, yea a greater right, to ask the Government to protect them? Why make this discrimination in favor of foreigners? I cannct see where the justice comes in, and I therefore appeal to this House to see that those terminal buildings are erected at Port Moody. If that is done the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any other company can extend the road to the moon if they like, so far as I am concerned. There are several other points on which I should like to address the House sometime longer, but I know the spirit of the House—

HON. MR. POWER—The House has no spirit.

HON. MR. MCINNES—It is not in a mood to listen to a long speech, and I have already occupied the time of the House much longer than I expected I would when I stood up; consequently I will subside for the present.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—As I said on a former occasion, I rise with great hesitancy to speak on a matter in which I am personally interested, but I feel more interested also as a public man in the completion, maintenance, perfection and prosperity of the Canadian Pacific Railway as one of the greatest institutions of this country, in which all Her Majesty's subjects in Canada, and many elsewhere, are interested. I also feel that private interests should give way to the public good, and I am not one of those who feel that we should restrain or hamper the

Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If they thought proper to build a branch or extension of their line from Port Moody to English Bay or Coal Harbor, I say let them go there.

HON. MR. MCINNES—With their own money.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I never took the position that the money given now and last year is anything else than a loan, and I will not take it now, but what I contend for is that the amendment which has been moved by my hon. friend is just and correct, and in accord with law and equity; that the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway has, by contract and by our statute law, been fixed by the Government, by the Canadian Pacific Railway and parliament, at Port Moody, that the Government have no right and cannot put up any terminal buildings at any point beyond Port Moody. They have no more right to put up the terminal buildings and water service at Coal Harbor or English Bay than they have to erect them at so e other inlet on that coast.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—They are not putting them up.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—My hon. friend interrupts me and says the Government are not putting them up; we know it; but they have agreed to put up certain buildings at the terminus of the line, which terminus was fixed at Port Moody. All we ask is that the Government fulfil their obligations, complete their engagements and the work there commenced. The terminus of the railway has been fixed by Order-in-Council not only by this Government but by the late administration. The Government, themselves, having determined that Port Moody should be the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, their functions, so far as that was concerned, ended, and without some act of Parliament empowering them to change the terminus they cannot put up their terminal buildings and water service anywhere else except at Port Moody. The Minister of Justice will not deny that position. That is my contention, and I am sorry I shall have to weary the House by quoting statutes in support of it. The statement of the right hon. leader of the Government has been referred to. It was made in the other House only a few days ago, and I presume he is correctly quoted in saying: "Under the contract and under the Act of Parliament the terminus is at Port Moody," and that no other extension can be recognized or subsidized by the Government—that English Bay or Coal Harbor forms no portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. That has been recognized also by the Opposition, who have declared over and over again, and through their leaders, that the terminus is adequate at Port Moody, and it is not inconsistent with the Orders-in-Council which were passed. We have the utterances, as I say, of no less a person than the leader of the Government that Port Moody is the terminus, and, therefore, I think it is but right to declare in this House that no buildings shall be erected by the Government elsewhere than at the terminus so fixed. The Government, I contend, have the right and must put up public buildings—and have no legal right or authority to put them up anywhere except at Port Moody, and it is a violation of public faith and duty if they are not put up there. Mr. VanHorne visited Port Moody, in the early part of last winter, and I was interested in the remarks he made while there. It cannot be said, it cannot be contended, the idea cannot for a moment be entertained that the Government in carrying out their agreement and constructing these buildings at Port Moody would be throwing away money, or that these structures would be lost or useless, because Mr. VanHorne remarked, and over and over again publicly declared, that the anticipations of the company were such that Port Moody would have a large trade, that it would be necessary to erect buildings there, that it must be an important station, that it was destined to command a large share of the shipping and be a great port, and command a trade equal to the extent of the harbor itself. Therefore it cannot be said, no one dare say or take that ground, that by putting them there they would be useless. Therefore in no way, either by reason, law or justice, or the public interest, can it be contended that they should not be put up at Port Moody. That was the terminus fixed by contract and by Act

of Parliament, and I again repeat that it is impossible for the Government to go beyond that and erect buildings elsewhere without the direct sanction and authority of Parliament. My hon. friend behind me says that "we will not put them up at all." I say Canada is bound, the Government are bound, by the Orders-in-Council and Acts of Parliament, and by the fact that many hundreds of persons have thought it proper, on the faith of acts of Parliament, to invest money in lands about Port Moody, to fulfil their engagement which they made and fixed by contract which they entered into by Act of Parliament—a contract the honor and good faith of which must be maintained between the people of this country and the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. Having said this much, and feeling as I do such a deep interest in the Canadian Pacific Railway, and wishing as far as possible its completion and prosperity, I do not wish to take, and I think that I am not now taking, a position hostile to the company. My feeling on the subject is quite the reverse, and as I told my hon. friend who spoke to me on this matter, I would rather forego everything I have invested at Port Moody than attempt to restrict or retard the Canadian Pacific Railway in their rights. If they want to go to Coal Harbor, if they have not a right to go there, we should give it to them. Perhaps we have the power to prevent them, as Parliament is omnipotent, yet I consider it would not be right that the company should be restrained from doing what they conceive to be in their own interest, when they do not conflict with public interests. I would like to refer hon. gentlemen to the law as to Government powers as it stands on this matter; I will try not to weary you. I refer the House to chap. 1 of 44 Vic. The first clause of the schedule in the contract is as follows: "Canadian Pacific Railway means the entire railway described in 37 Vic., Cap. 14." Now 37 Vic. chap. 14, section 1, says that the Canadian Pacific Railway is to be made "to some point in British Columbia on the Pacific Ocean * * * to be determined, and the course and line of the said railway to be approved by the Governor in Council." Then there is the end of the following section 2, which I believe should be read with the other, and is controlled by section 1. They must be read together.

HON. MR. PLUMB—That does not fix the terminus.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Wait a moment I will show it to you. We will see directly where it is; we will come to that; then we have section 15 of schedule A to the Act 44 Vic. chap. 1—the Act of 1881. It is as follows (I want hon. gentlemen to read it):—"The Company may lay out, construct, acquire, equip &c," and you will find it to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway only to port Moody. There the terminus was declared by Act of Parliament; but what have we more? I say there was an Order in-Council passed in this matter and I refer the House to the Order-in-Council of the Mackenzie Government dated May 1878 in which it was declared to be the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. And also the Order-in-Council, October 1879 by which the present Government confirm that choice. This Order-in-Council would fix the terminus beyond change except by express directions of Parliament. Then I contend the Government having performed their functions, having determined that Port Moody was the terminus their functions ceased and they could in no way alter the decision which had been arrived at. The power to determine was exhausted when the determination was made. The Government do not contend that they have altered it; the leader of this House says that Port Moody is, by contract and by Act of Parliament, the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as far as the Government is concerned. I say not only that, but by Act of Parliament and Orders-in-Council it has been fixed, and therefore the Government have no right, and they would be taking powers which they do not possess, to place buildings anywhere but at Port Moody. Therefore I contend it is but right and proper to declare that the Government do not recognize any other terminus but Port Moody at which to erect these buildings and that there the terminal buildings should be erected. As I said before section 1 of the Act 44 Vic. Cap. 1 section 1 ratifies the contract in the schedules. That is quite clear, and the

5th section of that Act shows that the Government may convey to the company with a suitable number of station buildings and with water service (but without equipment) those portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway "constructed or agreed by the said contract to be constructed by the Government etc.," the whole subject to the contract. Now I think I have shown that Port Moody was the terminus by law and by contract with the company, and that therefore the buildings must be put there and nowhere else. Clause 1 of the Construction Act provides that the western section is "the portion of said railway now in course of construction extending from Kamloops to Port Moody." Clause 6 requires the Government to complete by the 1st of May 1891 the remaining portion "between Yale and Port Moody", recognizing Port Moody through the whole of it. Clause 7 is the same as section 5 of the Act as to the transfer of the railway to be built by the Government, together with "a suitable number of station buildings and with water service." And clause 8 provides that as each portion of the road is received from the Government the company is to equip it. The Government is only to provide a suitable number of station buildings and the water service, that is tanks, etc. Under clause 7 and 8 the Government can build elevators, warehouses and station buildings, etc., as provided under the Act.

HON. MR. MACDONALD — The Government were to build the first buildings?

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Yes, and at Port Moody, and that is all we ask. The question is whether under clause 7 and 8 the Government can build elevators, wharves, docks, warehouses, etc., for the terminus. It might possibly build warehouses under power to build station buildings, but certainly not the others which either come under "equipment" or are not authorized to be built and transferred by the Government, inasmuch as there being an express enumeration of what the Government may do, it is forbidden to do anything more. The Government were to build that portion of it complete, the station buildings and water service at Port Moody. Under 44 Vic. cap. 1, which I have read, schedule A, section 15, the Canadian Pacific Railway shall extend from Callander to Port Moody, and certain branches are named, and other branches may be located as provided in the contract. As to the main line, clause 13 of the contract, the terminal point is the junction with the western section at Kamloops, and this is preserved by 45 Vic. cap. 53, section 1, allowing some other pass than the Yellow Head to be followed. The intention to preserve Port Moody as the western terminus is thus made very clear. It is beyond all doubt by section 13. Now it is true in section A, of 44 Vic. chap. 1 reference is made to "*any extension* of the said main line of railway, that shall hereafter be constructed or acquired by the Company," but as to *acquiring extension*, section 25 of schedule A, expressly defines what extensions and amalgamations may be made, and on what conditions. And as to *constructing extensions*, no express power is given to construct any extension. If the only act applying was this portion of 44 Vic. chap. 1, (which is the Company's charter) then by implication there would be an unlimited power to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway. But the Consolidated Railway Act 42 Vic. chap. 9 applies to this Canadian Pacific Railway, not only by its own terms as in its second section, but also by the express enactment in section 17 of 44 Vic. chap. 1. Certain sections of the Consolidated Railway Act do not apply (see 44 Vic. chap. 1, sections 17 to 23) but they have no bearing on this point. Therefore the only extensions the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. can build are such as are authorized by the Consolidated Railway Act. Now I do not think it is necessary to go any further than to have cited, as I have done to the House, the acts of Parliament and to show, as I said before, (and I want to impress it again) that the Government were to build at Port Moody—the terminus adopted and fixed by Act of Parliament, and in the contract with the company—those buildings, and the Government cannot construct them anywhere else but at Port Moody. Having determined that they should be there, the Government have no right to go beyond Port Moody and put up permanent build-

ings elsewhere. Not only are they obliged under that contract and under an Act of Parliament to put up the buildings there, but numerous persons having invested large sums of money upon the faith of Parliament, and expecting those buildings would be constructed there, the Government and Parliament, although they ought not,and I think cannot,under existing acts prevent the extension of the road if the company think proper, at the same time cannot break faith with the people of the country any more than they can with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, having fixed the terminus at Port Moody, people having gone in there under the solemn pledge of the Government, and the leader of the Government in this House having declared that the terminus of the railway, as far as the Government are concerned or can recognize it by Act of Parliament and contract, is at Port Moody. I am contending for public rights, whilst frankly admitting my interest in their maintenance. We have a right to expect nothing more than that this Government will carry out what they agreed to do, what they are pledged to do, what the people of the country expect them to do—to put up the buildings at Port Moody, and under the law they cannot put them anywhere else.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman who moved this amendment, and my hon. friend who has just seconded it, have told us with the utmost frankness that they have a personal interest in this matter, and that they are, in fact, advocating their own interests in the speeches which they have made to the House and the amendment which they ask the House to adopt. It has been my fortune to be some years in Parliament, and I never before knew a case where a man proposed a measure in his own interest. The usual rule is where a subject is brought before the House which concerns the interest of any of its members that that member takes no part in the discussion, and if he is particularly sensitive he retires below the bar, so that he may not seem to take any part. The course which has been taken to-day. although I suppose quite within the power of the hon. gentleman, yet seems to me so unusual, and one which I think ought not to creep into a precedent, that I feel bound to make the observation I have done with reference to its unusual character. In this particular matter, with this interest to serve, the hon. gentleman who proposes the resolution I think mistakes the position of matters, the position of the Government and the position of the company. As regards the position of the Government, they have not altered their arrangement with this company in any way. The arrangement which was made, and which has been referred to by the hon. member from Lunenburg, is an arrangement that still exists. Whatever the Government said about Port Moody, and whatever they stipulated in any contract about that place, remains said and stipulated. No arrangement is proposed by this Bill to alter that bargain in any sort of way. There is no suggestion and can be no suggestion—it is impossible for ingenuity to establish that there is any suggestion in this Bill in any way to absolve the Government from any part of their contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or to absolve the Company from any part of their contract with the Government in regard to the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or its terminus. The Company and the Government are both bound to construct the railway to Port Moody, and it is to Port Moody only that the Government have retained any of the grant of land. It is only for the purpose of running the line to Port Moody that they have retained a grant, and can anything show more strongly than the fact that they have given up their land between Port Moody and Coal Harbour that they were only concerned in constructing the line to Port Moody?

HON. MR. POWER—Will the Minister allow me to interrupt him one moment while dealing with that question? Will he be kind enough to deal with the question of the terminal buildings?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I will deal with that subject. The contract is to construct a line to Port Moody, and we have no concern with anything below that point. We could not show more conclusively than we have done that we took no concern in the country lying west

of Port Moody, than by consenting that the land which had been set apart for the purpose of the railway by the Government of British Columbia between Port Moody and Coal Harbor, should be given back to the Government.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B. C.)—I do not like to interrupt the hon. member—

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Then why do you do it?

HON. MR. MCINNES—Because I should like the leader of the House to say when they gave up the lands west of Port Moody, had they not had them in their possession for five years after they declared Port Moody to be the terminus, and after the contract was made to build the road? Why were they kept locked up to the great detriment of the country, if the Government did not own them? All this difficulty has arisen from the inaction and vacillating policy of the Government.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Although the hon, gentleman is so keenly interested in the matter, he does not understand it. We never had any land in our hands for the purpose of constructing this railway. We had a stipulation in the Act of the Legislature of British Columbia that they would retain and give to us in trust, for the purposes of this railway, a width of land extending twenty miles each side of the railway along its entire length; and wherever the length of the railway stops, there the grant of land stops, and there was no possibility of our refusing to give up land west of Port Moody. How could we? We had no right to the land except along the line of railway. The railway, so far as the contract is concerned, and so far as the Act of Parliament, and any compact with the company are concerned, stops at Port Moody, and we had no claim to land below that point, and as soon as the Government of British Columbia became satisfied that we were going to stop at Port Moody—that that was to be the terminus—they began a correspondence with us. They said—"If you have no right to the land west of Port Moody, you should abandon that,"—and after some correspondence that was done. Now, the hon. gentleman says we ought not to have done that.

HON. MR. MCINNES—I will read the Act. It is as explicit as it is possible to be. It was passed in 1879, and it specifies that any shortage—that is if there was any land in the 20 mile belt line of railway which was alienated by pre-emption, homestead or otherwise—might be made up out of contiguous lands, and it is mentioned here, in a dozen different places, and I should like to know if the land west of Port Moody is not contiguous? What did the hon. gentleman do last year? Did he not take 3,500,000 acres of land not contiguous to the railway but in the Peace River country—

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is another speech. The hon. gentleman says if there was a "shortage alongside of the railway"—that very expression gives up the point and shows that I am right in the argument I am using, that we had no claim whatever to any land beyond the line of railway. It is manifest, if the hon. gentleman will only consider what was done in the North-West and Manitoba. A certain width of land, 20 miles on each side of the line, was given to the railway. The same thing was done with the line in British Columbia. Of course when you get to the end of the line of railway there is no more land. Suppose instead of going to Port Moody at all, we had gone to some other inlet, we would have had no claim to land at Port Moody. It is quite clear if you have a strip of land which should run from the Speaker's chair to the bar, and that was your line of railway, when you got to the bar you could have no claim to anything beyond it. So here you had a claim to a grant of land all along the railway until you got to Port Moody; there the railway stopped, and the grant of land stopped, and the suggestion which the hon. gentleman makes that there was was a provision for the granting of contiguous lands, or lands to meet the shortage, as he phrases it, applies to what we were entitled to, down to the terminus but not below the terminus. On what basis or pretence could we ask for land beyond the terminus? Why should they do anything more than grant us 20 miles on

each side of the road for its entire length? On what basis could we ask them to do anything more?

HON. MR. MCINNES—Why use that word contiguous?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is, contiguous lands. We could not have the whole breadth of the land in British Columbia, and it turned out there was a deficit because lands had been granted, or otherwise parted with to the extent of 500,000 acres. We were to get in lieu of that 500,000 acres of land as near as possible to that locality.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—That is a matter of agreement.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—A matter of agreement, but there is no provision that we should have land below the terminus. It would be just as absurd as that we should ask for land in some other part of the country altogether. Then the hon. gentleman says that they propose to construct the line farther on and go down to Coal Harbor and that they are getting money from the country to do that. Now they are not getting money from the country to do that.

HON. MR. MCINNES—My amendment does not state anything about going beyond Port Moody, but my motion is that the Government carry out their contract to build the terminal buildings at Port Moody and then they can extend it if they please, but with their own money.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman said this: the country is going to lend them money to construct a line from Port Moody westwards.

HON. MR. MCINNES—So they are.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman repeats it. The country is not doing anything of the kind. The country will have completed their bargain when they get the road finished to Port Moody, and they are not lending this company any money to go beyond Port Moody. In the statement he has read, it is true the company show what they are going to do with the money, but he cannot say because they put that item in that it shows any more conclusively that this railway is going to be built by us or at our expense than by putting an item in for railway cars he could say that the country is going to pay for the rolling stock. They are going to spend $1,000,000 in new railway cars, for instance. Those cars are not to belong to the Government. The Government will not have anything to say about them; neither will the Government have anything to do with the building of the road between Port Moody and Coal Harbor, nor will they have anything to say about it, nor will they own it. The company, in their statement, show, in a general way, why they are in want of money, how much they want, and what they are going to do with it when they get it. Now, to say that they are going to build this extension from Port Moody to Coal Harbor out of this $5,000,000, is incorrect. In the next place, the money will be theirs when we lend it to them, and they will be obliged to repay it, and they will repay it next July; but to say, in the first place, that it is their money, and then to say that they must not lay it out as they please, is exceedingly contradictory. When it is loaned, it is not the money of the Government at all. Our whole duty will have been discharged when the road is completed to Port Moody. We do not propose to give this company any money whatever, and there is not a syllable in this Bill about expending the money we are loaning them west of the terminus, and that is the suggestion which the hon. gentleman makes—that this money is going to be expended west of the terminus; that it is public money, and that it is in the statement, which is a statement of the company showing what they propose to do, but it is not with our money, but with their own money, after they raise it. They show the way that they are going to spend the $15,000,000, when they get it, but it is not the Government's $15,000,000, it is the company's $15,000,000, and if they make a mistake in spending it, it is their, and not our, mistake, and we have ample security for it. He says that in this agreement we ought, perhaps, to prevent the company from building any water tank, or anything of that kind, on the west side of Port

Moody. It is very difficult to understand the amendment, but with such understanding as I have, the Government do not propose to do that; the Government have no power, as far as I can see, to erect buildings or to extend the road beyond Port Moody or except upon the Pacific Railway proper, and that extension will not be part of it. There is no difficulty about that, and if this Bill proposed anything of the kind I would say that the hon. gentleman is right and let it be amended; but it does not propose anything of the kind. Supposing one terminus of this road is at Montreal, at it is at this moment, is there any power in the Bill to go beyond Montreal? None whatever and we could not build a mile of railway, without additional legislative power, on the other side of Montreal. The power must be given by Parliament, and no power has been given to extend this line of railway beyond Port Moody, and we have no land and no money to extend it beyond Port Moody. The hon. gentleman is led astray by the position he is placed in, and I regret it. He is led astray by the belief that there are powers in the Bill which are not in the Bill, and by the belief that the Government are doing what they cannot do without legislative authority, and that the money to be raised by the Company is the money of the Government, and has to be expended as government money. These are great mistakes. The Bill is simply for the purpose of raising the money, and changing the relative positions of the Company and the Government in regard to money transactions; and that we should incorporate into it an unnecessary provision bearing upon a different subject, bearing upon the terminus at Port Moody and the expenditure of money at that terminus, is to me a most unreasonable thing, and I cannot but think that the House will reject it without any difficulty whatever.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I sympathize naturally with the two hon. members who are concerned in this matter; but I think we ought to consider this matter entirely apart from any feeling which might influence us in consequence of that consideration. We therefore had better disembarrass the question entirely of that feature, and perhaps my hon. friend from New Westminster would have done wisely if he had not introduced that so prominently into this debate. At the same time we must all give him credit for candor in stating to the House the relation in which he stood to this matter. I think also, for the purpose of getting a right conception of this question, which the House perhaps has not yet got, we ought to consider it entirely apart from the question as to what is to be done with this $5,000,000. It has been stated to us just now that this $5,000,000 is a loan. It is not a gift or grant of money to the Company for any purpose, and therefore it is hardly worth while embarrassing this question with any consideration as to that; but there are one or two points upon which I should like to have some little information. I think we have had some very clear and distinct information given to us with regard to one of the questions that I was about to ask, and that was, what right or authority have the Government to erect railway buildings 12 miles beyond Port Moody? That was the suggestion which arose from the line of argument pursued by the hon. gentleman who has offered this amendment. We have now a distinct answer from the Minister of Justice that the Government claim no power whatever to expend money to make terminal buildings beyond Port Moody.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—None whatever.

HON. MR. DICKEY—There was a question the other day that there was to be a round house built beyond Port Moody, and I confess that I was anxious to get some information and some assurance on that point, because I could not see how the Government could undertake to expend money 12 miles beyond the terminus of the Pacific Railway for such a purpose as that; but I have got the assurance now that no money is to be expended for that purpose by the Government.

HON. MR. MCINNES—The Government called for tenders time and again for the erection of this round house at Port Moody; if they carry out that work I am satisfied, but they have abandoned it.

HON. MR. DICKEY—The fact that they called for tenders supports the view which the Minister has laid before the House, that the Government claim no right whatever to build that round house or any other buildings beyond Port Moody. Another matter that I wish to have some information about is why did the Government give up this land? We have got an answer upon that point also. It occurred to me that there could only be one answer, and that is that the line, so far as the Government is concerned, proceeded no further than Port Moody, otherwise there would be no justification for their giving up the land between English Bay and Port Moody. They took power, not knowing where the terminus was to be originally, to have the reservation extend further than was absolutely necessary, because by their own order-in-council and by the act which has been read to us, the terminus was ultimately fixed, not at English Bay but at Port Moody; and therefore the land between those two points they claim to have nothing to do with whatever, and they tell us now that they have nothing to do with that land, and how it has got into the hands of the company, or by what sort of process is a matter, though it may require some explanation if it were necessary for us to inquire into it, we need not trouble our heads about, because after all it has really very little to do with this question. There is another matter that I would like to have some information about; that is, it has been stated to us that it is the intention of the company to extend this line to English Bay. I should like to know by what authority they do that—what authority there is for it in the Act, or in the contract, or what other authority there is? Because there may be some local law or authority for that purpose. That is a point upon which we have as yet no information; but it is quite clear, as far as the Government is concerned, they have given us a distinct assurance that no terminal buildings are to be built by them beyond the limits of the contract, which stopped at Port Moody. With regard to the other point, as to giving money for this purpose, I think we must be satisfied that this is a loan which will be collected. Whether it will ever be paid or not is perhaps a matter of some considerable uncertainty. At all events it is not a grant; it is certainly a loan; at the same time I quite agree with my hon. friend, that this large amount may or may not be a part of that $5,000,000, but I do not think it ought to enter into the question, because the great point, to which we should desire, as a legislative body, to direct our attention, is, do the Government propose to go beyond the limits of the powers which have been given to them by Parliament, and I do not see at present, as far as the matter has been presented to my mind, that they have; and therefore the amendment of the hon. member from New Westminster is unnecessary, after the assurance that has been given that the Government do not propose to take any powers greater than those given to them by the Act of 1881 and the contract that was made in consequence of that Act.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The power which the hon. gentleman refers to is given in the Act itself, which enables them to extend the main line if they see fit. It is at the end of clause 15. I think it is under that they are constructing this extension. I do not know that they have got any power from the Local Legislature.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B.C.)—They have an agreement only so far.

HON. MR. DICKEY—Then, if that is done, will not this lien which the Government have by those preferential bonds extend over the whole of that line?

HON. SIR. ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes it will, because the lien is over the whole of the Pacific Railway, and this clause says it shall only construct such a portion of the Pacific Railway.

HON. MR. NELSON—I think, Port Moody having been declared the terminus of the Pacific Railway, and it having been stated publicly by the Minister of Railways that it was to be the terminus, that not only should we look to the leader of the House for an assurance that no buildings would be constructed by the Government beyond the terminus of the Pacific Railway; but we should also look to the leader of the Government for the assurance that

the terminal buildings to be constructed at the terminus will be constructed. It has been publicly stated, first, I believe, in British Columbia and then rumored here that the Government had ceased the construction of the terminal buildings at Port Moody. It has also been stated that negotiations have been proceeding betweeen the C, P. R. Company and the Government for the purpose of stopping the construction of those buildings. If such is the case, and it is the intention of the Government that those buildings shall not be constructed at Port Moody, I think we can only look upon it as a breach of faith on the part of the Government with the people, and more particularly with those who invested their money at Port Moody. I think, therefore, it would be very satisfactory to have the assurance of the Government in this House that no buildings will be constructed beyond the terminus and that the buildings promised to be constructed at Port Moody as a terminus will be constructed.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—I can give no promise that would be more obligatory than the promise which the hon. gentleman quotes. The Government undertook to put up the buildings at Port Moody. There is the undertaking. If the hon. gentleman desires to ask any question on that subject, if he will give me notice, and an opportunity to consult with the Minister of Railways, I will be very glad to reply to him. In the meantime, I can say nothing stronger than the Government has already said, that the buildings are to go up there.

Hon. Mr. NELSON—There is a rumor that negotiations have been going on for the stoppage of the work on those buildings, and that the construction of the buildings has been stopped in consequence of those negotiations. My position is totally different from that of my two colleagues. I own not one dollar's worth of property at Port Moody.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—You can buy now easily.

Hon. Mr. NELSON—I think that this House, and the public, generally, would be satisfied with having some assurance that the terminal buildings are to be constructed at Port Moody.

Hon. Mr. POWER—It is to be regretted, perhaps, that this matter has been introduced to this House by a gentleman who has a personal interest in it, but I do not see that those gentlemen who are interested in it are open to any rebuke. The hon. member from New Westminster stated clearly and distinctly, when he first spoke about the matter, that he was personally interested in it, and the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg made the same statement with regard to himself.

Hon. Mr. McINNES—I forgot to mention to the House that while I am interested at Port Moody, I am interested to an equal extent down near English Bay and Coal Harbor, and was interested there years before the selection of the terminus; but the explanation I make is this, that I am not moving in this matter purely on pecuniary grounds, but to save my word, my honor, and that of the Government of the country, which should be considered above suspicion.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The hon. gentleman is safe as far as his personal interest is concerned.

Hon. Mr. McINNES—I am, but no thanks to the Government.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I do not think there is any rule of Parliament which prevents a member from taking part in a discussion on a matter in which he is interested. I think the general rule is that where a member is personally interested he makes his statement, and then retires from the Chamber or declines to vote; and I must say that that is a rule which is not observed quite as carefully as it should be either in this House or in the other House. Gentlemen have interests that are not avowed, on matters before the House, on which they vote. An hon. gentleman has taken the ground that there is a certain amount of impropriety in introducing this discussion in connection with this Bill. I fail to see that there is any impropriety in it. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company come to us and ask us to advance them $5,000,000 and to make

certain other concessions of considerable value in connection with the existing loan. It does not matter whether we are giving them the money or lending it to them; they come to us and ask us to lend them $5,000,000 in cash, and alter the existing arrangement about some other millions. Then I think when the company come to the Government, who represent the country, and ask them to grant them favors, Parliament has a right to say "we shall do what you wish, but we shall do it on certain conditions," and now the question is whether the condition proposed in the amendment of the hon. gentleman from New Westminster, is a reasonable one or not. Looking at all that has taken place, I think it is a perfectly reasonable condition. I quite concur in what the Minister of Justice said as to the propriety of giving up the land grant west of Port Moody, once the Government had decided that the western terminus should be at Port Moody. But if the western terminus of the road is at Port Moody for the purpose of the land grant, then it should be at Port Moody for the purpose of the terminal buildings also. I cannot see how the Minister can very well get out of that dilemma. If Port Moody is, as far as the Government are concerned, the western terminus of the road, then those terminal buildings which the Government were bound by the statute of 1881 and the agreement embodied in the statute to erect at the western terminus should be erected at Port Moody and no other place.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—That was not touched by the Minister of Justice.

HON. MR. POWER—It was touched by the Minister of Justice, but he did not deal with it in a satisfactory way. The Minister stated that there was no intention, as far as he knew, to place the buildings anywhere except at Port Moody. If there is any doubt, and there appears to be doubt as to the exact position of this matter, and as to the relative powers of the Government and the Company in connection with the location of those terminal buildings, that doubt should be removed; and the proper way to remove it is by an amendment to this bill. It is true that the Minister of Justice has stated that he knows nothing of any such proposed alteration in the location of the terminal buildings; but the hon. gentleman does not know everything that is going on between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Railway Department; and the hon. member from New Westminster has a right to use an extract from a paper which is regarded as the organ of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He told us what had been done by the Vice-President of the Canadian Pacific Railway in connection with the Local Government of British Columbia; and in the face of the express wording of the statute Yellow Head Pass was abandoned and Kicking Horse Pass was chosen at the request of the Company. Unless we get things in a very clear and positive way there is reason to believe that the Company will succeed in having their own will; and it appears that the will of the Company is that those terminal buildings shall be located at English Bay or Coal Harbor. I think we have a right to protect the good faith of the Government, just as we have a right to protect it in connection with the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Minister said that in one sense Port Moody was the western terminus, and then said again that he thought the Company had a right to extend the road under their charter. The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg has dealt with the legal aspect of this matter already; but there are one or two points which I may be pardoned if I refer to. The statute of 1874 provides that the western terminus shall be at some point in British Columbia on the Pacific coast to be determined by the Governor in Council. There were two Orders-in-Council passed, one by the Mackenzie administration in May 1878, and one by the present administration in October 1879, locating the terminus of Port Moody. In the statute of 1881, and in the contract with the Government, and in the private act—the act which is embodied in that contract, Port Moody is spoken of as the terminus; and I venture to say that a court would hold that Port Moody was the legal terminus of the road, and that the Government have no right to locate the terminal buildings anywhere else. The Minister of Justice seems to think that there is some doubt about that. Now, is there

not a proper and common sense way to remove that doubt by adopting the amendment of the hon. gentleman from New Westminster or an amendment in that direction? As to the wording of the amendment, I am not altogether satisfied with it; but an amendment to that effect will be right and proper. It will remove the doubts of the property owners there, and will satisfy the country that the terminus, as far as the Government is concerned, is fixed at Port Moody. I do not see why the Minister of Justice should object to confirming by statute what he has confirmed here by his statement. He has on two or three occasions confirmed the statement that the western terminus was fixed at Port Moody, and there is no reason why we should not place that statement in this Bill. The hon. Minister in one breath says that the Company have the right to extend the road, and in another breath he says, as far as the Government are concerned, the terminus is at Port Moody. What objection is there to removing all possible doubt by saying in this Bill that the Government shall erect the terminal buildings at Port Moody?

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B.C.)—I ask the hon. gentleman from New Westminster this question: Supposing the terminal buildings were placed at Port Moody to-day and the terminus was at Coal Harbor, what would be the benefit to Port Moody? None whatever.

HON. MR. MCINNES—The Government would then be acting in good faith.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is out of order; he has spoken several times already.

HON. MR. MCINNES—The hon. gentleman from Niagara should not interrupt me; he has been out of order and spoken several times, himself, this evening.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman from New Westminster has spoken several times already and I call him to order.

HON. MR. MCINNES—The hon. gentleman from Niagara should not interrupt me; his remarks are those of a pedantic plebeian and are unworthy of a gentleman occupying a position in this House.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—I expected the hon. member from New Westminster to bring forward a more business-like proposition than the one he has submitted to the House. If he had brought forward a proposition that the terminus should be confined to Port Moody there would be something business-like about it; but he says there is no objection to the terminus going 12 miles beyond Port Moody, if the terminal buildings are constructed at Port Moody.

HON. MR. MCINNES—Not if they extend the road with their own money.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—You are asking the Government to expend money in erecting terminal buildings at a place which will not be the terminus if the road is extended. The hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Lunenburg and the hon. member from Halifax have brought forward most untenable arguments in that way.

HON. MR. POWER—If the terminal buildings are erected at Port Moody, the road will not likely be extended any further.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—The contract to erect the terminal buildings is with the Syndicate, and if the Government and the Syndicate wish to vary the contract they can vary it.

HON. MR. POWER—The Minister of Justice says not.

HON. MR. MACDONALD — The terminus is to be the terminus fixed by the Government by Order-in-Council, and it can be varied at any time by the Government by Order-in-Council.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It is fixed by Statute.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—I was much surprised to hear the hon. gentleman from Westminster decry the future trade of this road, and say that the reason

the company wished to extend the road down to Coal Harbor was to get the whole of that territory for town sites. I thought the hon. gentleman from Halifax, and those who think with him, had a monopoly of this decrying of the country and of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The earnings of this road have been marvellous considering that it is yet in its incipient condition. In 1884 the earnings were over $5,000,000.

HON. MR. POWER—I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is not confining himself to the question before the House.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—Did not the hon. gentleman go to Yellow Head Pass and Kicking Horse Pass ?

HON. MR. POWER—Certainly.

HON. MR. MACDONLD—The hon. gentleman seems to wish to stick to Yellow Head Pass all his lifetime. The earnings of the road are over five and a half million of dollars this year already, and if such is the case at this early period in the history of the enterprise, the road will have a great deal of trade, and the argument of the hon gentleman is untenable, that while he does not restrict the road to the Port Moody terminus he wants to build the terminal buildings to be erected there.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am an old parliamentarian, independent in action, never seeking favors, and I have always felt and acted on the principle that my own private interests have to give way to the public good. I do not think that in this matter I am open to censure from the Minister of Justice, who said it would be more seemly if I had not expressed my views on the subject.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I did not use the word "unseemly" at all —I said unusual.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I say this is a public question, not one in which I alone am involved, but in which the public, a large number of the people of this country, are interested, not only at Port Moody but in other places; but if it were a public question in which I was personally interested,I have put my own interests aside. I have not solicited the vote or support of any hon. gentleman but I would be unworthy my position as a public man if I did not stand up in my place and declare my views to the best of my ability, claiming the independent judgment of hon. gentlemen on the merits of this case. If those are not the duties of a member of this House, then the functions of hon. gentlemen in this House are limited, if not entirely gone. There is scarcely a public question discussed in this Chamber in which some of us are not directly interested. We cannot deal with questions affecting public lands, or timber limits, or bank stock, or railways, or telegraphs that some of us are not interested in, and not only that, but we all know that Ministers of the Crown have personal interests in questions of the kind I have named, and we find members of Parliament taking fees and advocating interests as counsel before Committees in this House and in the other Branch of the Legislature, and this is the first time in my life that I have ever been told that such a position as I have taken here to day is unusual, or not consistent with the duties of a member of Parliament—especially after the calm, dispassionate manner in which I have treated this question. I treated it simply from a legal point of view, in the public interest—not to restrict the Canadian Pacific Railway but to aid them in the objects of this Bill. I said if my private interests only were concerned, they should give way to the public good. I did not wish to restrict the company from extending their line from Port Moody to Coal Harbor. If they have not the right to go to English Bay, we should give it to them and I felt from the first that the company should not be embarrassed; that we all, that Canada at large, have a deep interest in it; that we all consider that the early completion of that road is dear to us, and especially to our development, and I should be sorry in any way to attempt to embarrass the company in carrying out their mighty enterprise and what the country expect from them,by intruding upon this House my private interests. But I say this, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. and the Government have con-

tracted, and Parliament has given them the authority to make Port Moody the terminus. We have the declaration of the Government that Port Moody was, and remains established, the terminus, and beyond that we have no control, and we had a right to take their statement as being correct, apart from the fact that Port Moody is by law the terminus; therefore, all we ask, and the country have a right to expect and demand, is that the Government will carry out their pledges, and carry out the law, and construct those terminal buildings at Port Moody, regardless of where the company may make their own terminus of the railway. I do not wish to impute motives to the hon. gentleman from Victoria, but it is evident that he disregards the law, that the prosperity of some of his friends is not looked upon with any degree of pride on his part, and if he could thwart the interests of those gentlemen, and of those who purchased lots from himself, he seems inclined to do so, and asks what is the necessity of constructing the terminal buildings at Port Moody when the Canadian Pacific Railway terminus is to be at English Bay. He seems to have but little regard now for Port Moody—his interests are not there. Apart from the legal rights and obligations of the Government to erect buildings at Port Moody, does he not know—has it not been declared that Port Moody was and would still remain an important seaport on the Pacific coast? Does he mean to tell me that if the Government carry out what they are pledged and bound to carry out, what the faith of the country and parliament are pledged to, that they will put up the buildings there? We have the assurance and knowledge from the Government and the press that those buildings were tendered for at Port Moody, that tenders have been placed in the hands of the Minister of Railways, and in consequence of the action or intents of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, these tenders have not been determined on, or an award has not been made. Therefore, although the leader of the Government in this House tells us that they cannot put up the buildings at any terminus that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company may themselves agree upon, he admits that, but the country will demand of them that they erect, in the interests of the public, the buildings which they agreed to put up, and where they undertook to erect them at the place selected and where the law requires them as the terminus—Port Moody—that they cannot, in consequence of any individual interest or company's interest, whether it is a Minister of the Crown or a rich syndicate, or both, or any other persons possessing interest at another point, disregard the decision so solemnly arrived at and do violence to acts of parliament and contracts. I regret to have to speak again on this matter. My whole deportment, my action, and the important manner in which I approached this question, are within the judgment of hon. gentlemen, and they did not justify the Minister of Justice in passing a stricture on my conduct or my remarks.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The word I used was "unusual," and after the remarks of the hon. gentleman and the manner in which he seems to have been wounded by what I said, I apologize for having used the expression and beg to withdraw it.

HON. MR. MACDONALD—I am in the same boat as the hon. gentleman. I own property there, but the amendment is so illogical that I cannot support it.

HON. MR. DICKEY—As the point has been raised by the hon. member for Lunenburg I wish to state, as far as my individual opinion is concerned, that there is nothing to prevent the hon. member from New Westminster or the hon. member from Lunenburg from speaking or voting upon this question. It is nothing but fair to those hon. gentlemen who are placed in such a delicate position to make this statement.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The only reason I formed a different impression was that each gentleman as he rose said, that although he had a personal interest yet so and so.

HON. MR. DICKEY—An interest in common with other persons as Her Majesty's subjects, not a direct personal interest.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The authority will be found at page 395 of Bourinot. He says:—

"Though the Senate has no rule like that of the Commons in relation to this subject, senators observe the same practice. When the bill is of a public nature, a member of the Senate may properly vote if he wishes to do so. The Lords have never formally adopted a resolution on the subject, because it is presumed that the personal honor of a peer will prevent him from forwarding his pecuniary interest in Parliament; but they are exempted by standing order from serving on any committee on a private bill in which they are interested."

Here is a resolution which certainly these gentlemen have advocated upon the ground that they have a private interest in restricting the company to Port Moody as the terminus.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—No.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. That is the ground on which they advocate the amendment—on the principle that at Port Moody they have made investments on the strength of the promise that the terminal buildings of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be erected there. Now they propose by a resolution to compel the erection of those buildings. If that is not in support of their personal interest I fail to have any logical idea of anything. I certainly, myself, should not suggest that they should not vote. The very courteous manner in which my hon. friend on my right has treated me would prevent me making such a suggestion. His manner being that of a gentleman I should be glad to facilitate him, and I should be very sorry that the suggestion has arisen, but there is the precise wording of the regulation at page 395.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Does my hon. friend say that this is a Bill of a private nature?

HON. MR. PLUMB—No, it simply says where members are interested in a private matter.

HON. MR. MCINNES—"Private Bill" it says.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It makes no difference; they say their interest leads them to offer this resolution. The hon. gentlemen have stated it as plainly as possible. The hon. gentleman said, in the first place, that on the strength of the promise that the Government should have the station and other buildings at Port Moody, and to make that the terminus for the railway, he had, himself, made investments, and led other people to make them. Then he proposes a resolution to compel the Government to erect those buildings there. Now, if that is not in furtherance of his interests, I fail to understand anything about business.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I have a very few words to say on this measure before I give this vote. I cannot be accused of being adverse to anything calculated to benefit the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I am one of those who voted for the contract, and for the $30,000,000 loan. I said at the beginning of the session, when it was stated that the loan this year would be for $15,000,000, that I would vote for it. I, said further, that if the company would ask, not for a loan but a gift, I would vote for it, so strongly am I in favor of that road and in favor of the development of the North West and of the terms of Union with British Columbia being carried out. So I cannot be accused in this instance of being influenced by any hostility to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I have sat here during the whole of this debate and heard the arguments on both sides, and I must say if I am bound, as I believe I am, to stand up, as I always endeavor to do, for what is right, I cannot help voting for the amendment, and I say the reverse is not equitable or just. The Government have made their choice: the choice was made years ago of Port Moody as the terminus. To-day by some side wind an attempt is being made to evade that decision, and I cannot give my support to anything of the kind. I am responsible, not only here, but later I shall be answerable for every vote I give in this Chamber. That is my opinion, and when I vote I must be convinced that I am right before my vote is recorded. I believe that the change of the terminus is a great wrong. Hon. gentlemen in this House may take

their own course, but it must be surprising to see me in this instance for the first time voting against that company and that great enterprise, but I am bound in honesty to do so. The Minister of Justice has said to-day, and the fact of his stating it shows that it must be true, that the intention of the Government is to make Port Moody the terminus, and that they have abandoned their claims to lands west of Port Moody. Then the logical consequence of that is that the buildings which the Government by their contract are bound to erect at the terminus ought to be constructed at Port Moody, I believe that is sound and logical. If it is, then there is only one thing to do —it is to stand by it and put it in practice. As to the interests of the hon. mover of this amendment I was astonished to hear such a discussion. If there was any kind of objection to their votes or to their right to vote in this House on this question, then we would have probably to force Ministers to withdraw—to force members of both Houses to withdraw, and from what I have seen in the past they have not withdrawn on such occasions. The interest of the mover of this resolution is not a direct one, any more than when the North Shore was built I should be told not to vote for the enterprise because that road passed my property. I every day seem to become more and more set in my own way. It is because I find there is not enough respect for what is right or what is just. I cannot understand public matters being dealt with except in a just and straight-forward way, and I cannot refuse to support this amendment. As I said the other day, when justice, equity and principle are not at stake, then I follow my leaders blindly, but when justice or equity are in question then I have to stand by those grand principles, and if I have to vote against my leaders I am sorry for it. I have been for forty-three years in public life, and have stood by Conservative principles, and I should not like to desert them now ; but there are responsibilities which must be respected by every conscientious man. In my opinion the amendment ought to be adopted, and I shall vote for it.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—As I am about to vote on this motion I should like to put one question to the Minister of Justice. It is this : In case the Government of Canada will be compelled at some future day to take back this road from the Company will they have the power to also take the extension from Port Moody to Coal Harbor ?

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—Without any restriction or legal quibble ?

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

Hon. Mr DEVER—Then I am satisfied.

Hon. Mr. McINNES—I certainly felt very much hurt, as the hon. member from Lunenburg did, when the Minister of Justice referred to the fact that my hon. friend and I were interested in property at Port Moody, after the full and ample explanation which I made at the commencement of my remarks, and after the hon. Minister of Justice himself referring to it in reply to my address about a week ago. I really thought my explanation was sufficiently plain and explicit, and that I would not need to make any further reference to it. I stated distinctly that it was not on my own behalf, but on behalf of those that the Government and myself had induced to invest at Port Moody that I was standing up here to advocate their rights and claims. I stated also that I had property, not quite as valuable, probably, at the other place ; so that, to a certain extent, I was largely benefitted by the building of the railway, no matter whether the terminus remained at Port Moody or went to English Bay. Just one word in reply to my hon. and considerate colleague from British Columbia. I am very sure this House must be often surprised to find that scarcely a question arises in this House but my hon. friend is sure to take the opposite side—he is sure to echo, never fails to echo, the sentiments of the Government of the day. I say I regret it, and it must appear unseemly that when there are only three of us from that distant province, we are generally divided on every subject that comes before this House affecting the interests of our province. He often rises to advocate points which do not

meet my approval—but do I oppose him? No. He on this occasion has gone so far as to say that I decry the country. I challenge him, or any man in this House or out of it, to point to one word of mine uttered publicly or privately that can be justly construed into defaming or decrying the country.

HON. MR. MACDONALD — The trade of the country, I said.

HON. MR. MCINNES—I say this, and I do not say it boastingly: I have opinions of my own, and I have the courage of my convictions, and will express them whether it pleases the Government or displeases them. Before taking a seat in this Senate I took an oath, but it was to my Queen and country and not to a Government or party, and just so long as I have the honor of occupying a seat here, just so long shall I support the right, no matter where or from whom it emanates. As it is nearly six o'clock I will refrain from making any further remarks now but will reserve them until the third reading of the Bill.

The committee divided on the amendment, which was rejected. Contents, 12; non-contents, 28.

HON. MR. O'DONOHOE, from the committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

The Senate adjourned at 6 o'clock.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, July 16th, 1885.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

TIMBER REGULATIONS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

MOTION.

HON. MR. MCINNES moved—

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General; praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid before this House, copies of all memorials, letters or telegrams, addressed to the Department of the Interior or any member of the Privy Council, respecting the Land and Timber Regulations affecting Dominion Lands in British Columbia.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The attention of the Government has been drawn to this subject again and again by an hon. member of the other House, who represents the electoral district of Westminster, Mr. Homer, who has exerted himself since the beginning of the session to effect some change respecting the land and timber regulations relating to Dominion lands in British Columbia, and the country will be indebted to him for any change that may be made. Of course there is no necessity for saying anything further on it, as the papers will be brought down and will show the exertions he has made.

The motion was agreed to.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Bill (158), "An Act to authorize the granting of further subsidies to and making further provision for the construction and efficient operation of the railways therein described." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPLETION BILL.

THIRD READING.

The order of the day having been called for third reading of Bill (153), "Further to amend the Acts respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to provide for the completion and successful operation thereof."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved:—

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be amended as follows:—

Page 2, line 19.—After "council" insert "and the provisions of the 35th section of the Charter of the Company shall apply to the Bonds to be issued, or to any mortgage deed to be executed under this Act."

HON. MR. POWER—What is the effect of that amendment?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The effect is to do away with any doubt as to the registration of the mortgage. The original charter of the company provided that their mortgage need not be registered. It would be very difficult to register the mortgage in all the counties through which it passes, and this Bill is to make sure that it applies to this mortgage under this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. PLUMB—After the very able address with which the second reading of this Bill was introduced, I did not make any further extended remarks upon it, but after the very unable address which was made by my hon. friend opposite, perhaps, a few words may be necessary.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear!

HON. MR. PLUMB—My hon. friend was evidently floundering with his subject, and we all felt a certain amount of commiseration for him, but he made certain statements that may be referred to. A good deal has been said about the way in which the road has been constructed through the mountain passes with regard to the change of route from Yellow Head Pass to Kicking Horse Pass. With reference to that I may say that the construction of the road has been governed by the contractors as any business man would govern any great enterprise. They have taken the best advice they could procure. They have made the most thorough examination they could, and have finally decided upon a route which I understand has been laid out by one of the most expert mountain engineers in the world, Major Rogers, a man who has been employed in work of that kind and was selected by the company for the purpose of exploring, thoroughly examining, and finally deciding upon the location of the route through the mountains. I understand, also, that the engineers of the different railways in the United States, who have had similar work to do, have examined this road and they have expressed their entire approval of it in every respect. Something has been said about the curves and grades on that road. My hon. friend made some remark in respect of that. Now, comparing it with the grades of other roads, the maximum grade of the Union Pacific road, as stated by a gentleman in the other branch of the legislature, who made a most exhaustive speech on the subject a few days ago, and who, I dare say, stated his side of the case with as much precision as it could possibly be stated, said that the maximum grade of the Union Pacific was 90 feet to the mile for 16 miles, and the maximum grade of the Canadian Pacific Railway was between 116 and 117 feet for 16 miles. It is well understood that under certain circumstances these heavy grades are not particularly objectionable. In the early days of railroading and light locomotive power, it was considered desirable to keep down the grades and in fact the first roads that were built on this side of the Atlantic were constructed on a dead level. They overcame grades by stationary power, which was the case of the Albany & Schenectady road, which ran over the sand plain by means of a stationary engine and was let down on the other side, and that continued for a long time after I was in the habit of passing over that road. Neither curves nor grades were supposed to be possible. The old idea of engineering has been changed, and I can say to hon. gentlemen that the most successful road in the United States to-day—that is, the Baltimore and Ohio—has far heavier grades than the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then a good deal has been said about the failure of the Company to show that they are going to have a large Pacific Ocean traffic. I am not aware that any large calculation has been made upon that. The truth of it is the through traffic, as compared to the way traffic, of all the railways that have been successful and are in operation now, of which we know anything, is in the ratio of at least four or five to one, the way traffic being larger by far. I fancy mostly all the successful railways have had that experience. The Union Pacific and Central Pacific are supported not by the traffic from San Francisco, although that is moderately large, but by the traffic along the line. They do not know how it springs up, but it is there. The railways promote it; the whole rail-

way system of the west has been built up in advance of settlement, the population and traffic have followed them. All those familiar with the railways west and east of the Mississippi know that this statement is correct, and we have no reason to suppose that the Canadian Pacific Railway will be any exception. They seem to have no reason to suppose it themselves, for I can tell hon. gentlemen that they have prepared for a traffic of which they must in some way have been assured, by putting down 21 miles of side track in their Winnipeg station alone. That does not look as if they did not expect to have business. I know that to be the fact; I also know, for I have seen the photographs of all their great works, that their structures are of the most substantial character. The road has been built, as has been certified by the late leader of the Opposition in the other House, who went over the line, in the most substantial manner, and it is very difficult to argue with gentlemen who, on the one hand, insist upon it that we are throwing away our money and it will never be received back, and on the other hand insist upon it that this road has got such valuable franchises, such enormous privileges, that it is to make all those parties interested in it far too rich in the construction. Now, one side or the other must be true. My impression is that the gentlemen who build it are entitled to a profit out of their enterprise. I hope they will make it, and my belief is the road will be successful. My impression is that the security which has been given to us now in the shape of $20,000,000 of first mortgage bonds forming part of the $35,000,000 lien upon the whole road, is a good security. It is secured by property estimated by the leader of the Opposition in the other House at far over $100,000,000—in fact he makes out that the property is worth more than that—

HON. MR. HOWLAN—He says $116,000,000.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Yes $116,000,000 and on another occasion he raised it to $140,000,000.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. member will have his turn.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman has no right to misstate the figures.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman will be kind enough not to interrupt me. I merely repeat that with what is estimated as the value of that property, if a mortgage of $35,000,000 is not secured by it, I do not know anything about railways and railway property.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not think the hon. gentleman does.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Well I have had some experience of railways and I think I know something about them. For the Government loan $20,000,000 of those bonds are put in the hands of the Government and a further loan of about $5,000,000, about which there has been considerable discussion, is secured by $8,000,000 bonds. I fancy that loan could have been made elsewhere.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I know it could have been if it had not been for the persistent misrepresentation of that great enterprise by gentlemen on the opposite side; if it had not been for the fact that they seem to have struck hands with every element that has been in opposition to the development of the North-West and the construction of that great road. If the Company have been crippled, whose fault is it? If they have been compelled to come back to us—if their stock has fallen to 31 or 32 in the market, as it did at one time, whose fault is it? Who has ever spoken a good word for it of those who ought to have felt that it was a great national enterprise, and therefore at least entitled to the benefit of a doubt? A corporation in the United States has been opposed to it from the beginning; the great land grant roads of the United States have been opposed to it because they felt that the opening up of the great wheat-growing districts of the North-West was largely injuring their own property because of the land grants that had been given in aid of their roads somewhat

similarly situated to ours. They know perfectly well that in Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska and Iowa the culture of wheat has been gradually falling off, that the production per acre has been diminishing; they know perfectly well that the time must come when the wheat-growing district on this side of the Atlantic will be in the Canadian North-West, and they have endeavored, as far as they could, to prevent the opening up of that country. We have had only one who has had relations with the country on the other side, whose name I can recall at this moment, who has stood by us from the beginning, and that is Consul Taylor, of Winnipeg, who has been from the first a great friend of the enterprise and the strongest advocate of the claims of the North-West as a great field for the culture of wheat. The average crop in Minnesota last year was only 13 bushels to the acre, and in Dakota only 14 bushels, and in spite of what we hear about the grinding monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the farmers below the border have come to Emerson and sold their wheat there and paid the Canadian duty, because it was cheaper for them to do that than to send their grain over the railways of the United States, and yet we are told that this grinding monopoly is killing the farmers in the North-West. I was led to make some comparisons between the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway and that of other roads similarly situated, particularly as it now comes to us to ask for additional assistance and one of the notes—if a man may use that word—of the condition of the railway is the report of the material which operates it—the plant, the rolling stock, the cars, the depot grounds, all its arrangements. These show whether it is a live road, as one may say, or whether it is not. I was perfectly astounded when I made the calculation, and I will in a few words give hon. gentlemen some idea of what has been done by that Company in the way of preparing for the great traffic which it must command. The Northern Pacific has a mileage of 1750. It owns 289 locomotives, 174 passenger cars, and 7,500 baggage and freight cars. The Canadian Pacific Railway owns 304 locomotives, 282 passenger cars, and 7,550 freight and baggage cars. Now how does it compare with the Union Pacific? That is one of the two great roads running across the continent from San Francisco to the Mississippi River. The Central Pacific owns 235 locomotives, 267 passenger cars, and 4,720 baggage and freight cars.

HON. MR. WARK—How about the mileage?

HON. MR. PLUMB—The mileage of the Central Pacific is 1,215 and they operate 3,003 miles. The mileage owned and to be operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway is not so great now, but it will be larger with the branch lines; but without having their lines entirely open, they have still got a far larger equipment than either the Central or the Union Pacific. I will give the other now. The Union Pacific has 342 locomotives, 282 passenger cars and 6,737 freight and baggage cars. It has a few more locomotives than the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Union Pacific operate 1,835 miles of road. That is probably a little more than the Canadian Pacific Railway were operating when they made this report. Now those roads, the Union Pacific and Central Pacific, received from the Government of the United States, one of them on 1033 miles, $27,226,000 in cash, and 12,800 acres per mile. The Central Pacific received in cash $27,885,000, and 12,000,000 acres of land. The Northern Pacific has received a very much larger subsidy, some 35,000,000 or 40,000,000 of acres altogether. The earnings of those roads, and I do not suppose they are yet at their maximum, are as follows:—

Central Pacific, gross earnings, $24,744,000:

Net earnings, $8,094,000.

Capital stock, $59,225,000:

Bonds, $59,675,000—that is $113,000,000 very nearly, upon 1215 miles of road. The Union Pacific has a capital of $60,685,800, and its bonded debt is $13,930,113, and it has 835 miles of road. The gross earnings of that road are $21,000,000. The net earnings, $10,846,000, so that the traffic, which only extends from the Missouri River westward, has developed since these roads were built through a desert, through a wilderness, and

through a much more difficult country to work over, and through a much more unpromising country to settle. These roads have developed a traffic, since they commenced business, of $45,000,000 a year on about 3,000 miles of road; their net earnings to-day are nearly $20,000,000. From that we ought to imagine that a road, having the unique advantage of the control of a line from seaboard to seaboard, which no other road on this continent has, ought at least to command the confidence of the public as to its ability to pay the interest on its debt if it does not do anything more. There is no other road in this country which crosses the Rocky Mountains that has not to pay tribute to the owners of eastern roads, who are themselves powerful corporations, and will give no traffic to either of these rival roads unless they get the lion's share. The Canadian Pacific Railway is in a position and will be in a position to make a tariff from seaboard to seaboard without asking anybody's favor, and I predict the result will be that they will get large connections in the west seeking an Atlantic port by roads running in from below the boundary from the southwest to the northeast. I think that must be apparent to anybody who looks at the favorable position which this road holds: the road is under one control and belongs to one company, and yet we are constantly told by gentlemen in this House, gentlemen whose business interests, I undertake to say, have been promoted and whose political existence has been prolonged by the building of that road, that this is a line in which we are not to have confidence. They undertake to oppose it. I have heard gentlemen say that this company, having their means in this road and having their reputation at stake, were not competent to select a terminus for their own road,or to choose the best place to accommodate the enormous business that is to come over 3000 miles of railway, but that they must be confined to one particular spot. I do not think it is at all a liberal view of the question. I think they ought to be left to judge for themselves, just as they are left to judge whether they will go through one mountain pass or another, which is of no consequence to any human being but themselves. There was no traffic there to be served. The location had been made by the previous Government, and I dare say orders-in-council were passed with regard to that which have been changed since—in spite of the contentio of my hon. friend opposite—and a location was made by the narrows of Lake Manitoba, but it was found when it came to be examined, that some two or three hundred miles of that road ran through muskegs. We know at any rate that the Government had so decided upon the location of the road there that they actually built a telegraph line as an adjunct to it before the road was laid out. This is a specimen of the railway building of the late Government and of their care of the public interests and the public treasury. They built a line of telegraph contracted for by Mr. J. W. Sifton, and by Mr. Glass, an ex-member of the other House, and where that telegraph line was located a gentleman who was present, who is my informant, told me that he saw a man climb a telegraph pole to adjust the wires and as he climbed,the pole sank down, and when he got to the wire he was no higher than when he started, and when he got off the pole it shot up like a cork from a bottle of ginger beer. There was no bottom there. I have no doubt the gentleman, who is now in the House, will corroborate every word I have said about that, if necessary. The present Government did not take the road up there. They found a better line. Some people were disappointed. Then this company put their money into the concern: they examined the country and decided upon the line which has been followed, and I believe their decision will be justified by future events. Another point in regard to this road which has been dealt with, and which may be considered a very important one, with regard to its future destiny, is, that they have discovered in the mountain passes where that road goes the finest growth of timber in the world. The Douglas pine grows there. My hon. friend opposite, Mr. Nelson, knows more about it than I do, and statements were made not long ago that between the Rockies and the Cascade range there was a growth of timber which was absolutely unparalleled on this continent. It grows to an enormous size and the road will have traffic in that line which will be of incalculable value. We know that not-

withstanding all the disadvantages resulting from the troubles in the North-West, the calling away of teams and farmers for transport purposes, there has been so large an acreage brought under cultivation that the crop of this year, it is estimated, if there is no further difficulty in the North-West, will be seven or eight millions of bushels and will yield a surplus of at least 5,000,000 bushels. I mention these facts because it seems to be a habit of hon. gentlemen on the other side to make an attack on that road whenever they have an opportunity, and couple it with an attack on the North-West and its capabilities. It is unfortunate that hon. gentlemen are in that position. It is unfortunate that they have been compelled by the exigencies of their position, by the fact that they are opposed to the Government, to stand in opposition to all the great enterprises which have distinguished the Dominion of Canada since confederation. They are compelled to do that or else they are no longer in opposition. I feel great sympathy with them. It is their misfortune, but they do not seem to be able to see or to understand the logical conclusion of their policy. The hon. gentlemen have been in the minority for the greater part of the time since confederation, and I think it may be very clearly inferred that they will continue to remain a minority as long as they continue their unwise course. The people of Canada are progressive: they are not pessimists as a rule. They are a young people looking forward to a future, and they will not believe that the country is being depopulated. They do not believe that a country, with an almost prohibitory tariff on the other side, is a place of refuge because there is a moderate tariff on this side, and as long as the leaders of the Reform party indulge in that kind of argument just so long will they be unable to command the confidence of the people of Canada. If the Opposition were to be believed the whole credit of the country would have been paralyzed this year. Everybody knows the rabid attacks that have been made upon it. It has not been done to a great extent here, because the Opposition in this House has not taken that line. It has been left to one or two gentlemen who have placed themselves in the front rank to take that position. But what has been the effect of the policy of the Opposition in another place? While the most venomous attack was being made on the country there, the people of Great Britain were rushing into the money market of London to take the 4 per cent stocks of Canada and subscribe three and four times as much as was asked for, and take it at a better price than any loan that was ever made by hon. gentlemen on the other side, although the public debt has swollen to a large amount. I went to the Treasury Department to get a statement of the debt as it stood on the 30th June last, and I found that there was only $100,000,000 difference between the calculation of the hon. gentleman and the facts as they stand on the books of the Dominion.

HON. MR. CARVELL—A mere trifle.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Yes, a mere trifle. A sum of $100,000,000 is of no consequence if you can only paralyze the business of the country and show the people on the other side that they should not invest in the stocks of this country—that the country is making rapid strides towards bankruptcy. To be sure some hon. gentlemen on the other side have not joined in that cry; a large majority of them have always sustained any increase of the public debt for proper purposes, and the Government can only be judged by that. If we owed $100,000,000 and had not anything to show for it we would be in a worse position than we are now.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—The country has supported the expenditure.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Yes, the country has endorsed it and has given a verdict on it already and will again.

HON. MR. POWER—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman opposite knows perfectly well the kind of agitation that has been going on through the country, that the people take no stock in that kind of agitation, and that it has not had the effect intended. The hon. gentleman knows that the increase of the public debt has not equalled the expenditure on capital account. It has been the policy of the party to which

I belong to place very considerable sums in the permanent expenditure which might have been, under other circumstances, charged to capital account and represented by debt. Some fifteen or twenty million dollars or more than that—I do not give the sum in exact figures—have been expended on works properly chargeable to capital account, and which do not appear in the public debt, and the public debt is so much better for that kind of expenditure. Every dollar, I venture to say, that has been legitimately expended on the Pacific Railway, if we never get a shilling of it back again, is of great value to this country, and is worth all that it cost; but I believe that the whole of the advances made to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are perfectly safe, as a business operation, and I will tell the hon. gentleman why I believe it. It is because behind the debt of the company we find there are $65,000,000 of stock held by over 1200 or 1500 subscribers, and that stock, which is now selling at 40 cents on the dollar, is not worth one shilling if the mortgage which stands behind it is not good for its face. That is the reason why I say the security is good here. The security has the backing of the $65,000,000 of stock which is worth $25,000,000 in the market to-day, besides the mortgage being a first lien on the road. The loan of $5,000,000 which has been objected to is a perfectly legitimate thing, and the company have been forced to come here because their credit has been paralyzed by exactly such statements as those made by the hon. gentleman yesterday, that they have not paid their employees.

HON. MR. POWER—It is true.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon, gentleman has no authority for it, and he has no right to make such a statement.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman has no right to make such an assertion. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman from Niagara said that I made a statement which was not true.

HON. MR. PLUMB—No, I said no such thing.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman said I had no authority for making the statement, and I have the best of authority.

THE SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman was perfectly in order in saying that the hon. gentleman said it without authority.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman from Halifax also said—and I was surprised after the arguments that had been adduced upon that question that he would have ventured to refer to it—that the $14,000,000 deposited with the Government as a security, for the payment of the dividends upon the Canadian Pacific Railway stock, should be given up to the Canadian Pacific Railway, or practically the same thing, that the $5,000,000 which they asked for should be taken out of that money, a security deposit, a deposit held by the Government by the most solemn trust, held as a sub-trust by the Bank of Montreal, referring to 1,400 or 1,500 shareholders scattered all over Europe and America. The hon. gentleman proposes that we should break faith with those men. I have never known party animosity and party stress to carry any set of men so far as I have seen the Opposition carried in this case, when they propose that we shall repudiate a contract for the purpose of making a concession out of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Not only that, but it was first suggested by the leader of the Opposition in another place, then it was crystalized into a resolution and brought forward as a solemn motion, that $5,000,000 of that money, which was held in trust, should be diverted from its trust and paid back to the company to do what they liked with it, that company which they have no confidence in and cannot depend on, that they should have that money handed over to them to waste it in bad locations or extravagant connections — money that belongs to the shareholders or has been pledged to them. The resolution did nto carry, but it was not the fault of the hon. gentleman's friends that it failed, because it was voted for by a strict party vote under the direction of the leader of the Opposition. I have never known anything in the whole history of Parliament more monstrous than that deliberate attempt to repudiate a contract, and I can well understand how the public look upon

the hon. gentleman's friends when they see them disposed to do such a thing as that. I can well understand why there is a distrust of the leaders and advisers of that party.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—Order, order. I call the hon. gentleman to order for criticizing the conduct of gentlemen in the House of Commons.

THE SPEAKER—I think the hon. gentleman from Niagara is in order in criticizing the conduct of any member or any party in the House of Commons, but he would not be in order in criticizing the conduct of the whole body of the House of Commons.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I have not mentioned the other House by name; neither have I mentioned the collective action of the other House. I have a perfect right to speak of matters which bear upon the general argument and which bear on any public work, or on the policy of a party. If it were not for that there could be very little latitude in debate. I do not intend to say anything further, but I trust that this Bill will receive the assent of a large majority of this House, which has always been faithful to the trust reposed in it, in assisting as far as possible the public credit and great public enterprises like this. The arrangement strikes me as being one which is perfectly business-like, one which is perfectly safe, one to which we may, with entire confidence, give our affirmative vote, and I fail to see that anything has been said either in this House, or in another place, that should for one moment affect the public confidence either in the construction or completion, or the future prospects of the great transcontinental road upon which depends the future of Canada, and as to which so much has been done to thwart it and injure its character by, I will not call it an unpatriotic opposition (because they act only as far as they know, but do not see beyond the point of the opposition of the present moment), yet in spite of all that opposition I predict that before we meet here another session we shall see that road in full operation. We shall see it fulfilling largely the expectations that have been formed of it, and have very little thanks to offer to the hon. gentlemen who have so strenuously opposed and misrepresented it from the beginning.

HON. MR. POWER—I have given notice of an amendment which I propose to move at the third reading of this Bill, and before moving that amendment, I am sure the House will pardon me if I venture to make a few observations on the rather remarkable speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I have not made a practice of undertaking to criticise the speeches of other hon. gentlemen in this House or to question their taste or their policy; but I may say it is a somewhat remarkable thing that on the third reading of a Bill which was about being read almost without any opposition, a supporter of the measure should make such a speech as that which we have just listened to—a speech which would have been very proper on the second reading of the Bill, but is altogether out of place at this last stage of the measure. I hope the House will excuse me for departing a little from my usual practice. As I said, I have not been in the habit of remarking on the speeches of other members and their conduct, and I think the House will not deny that I have stood a good deal of very unpleasant language at various times from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear, hear. You do not mean me?

HON. MR. POWER—I think it is proper to call attention to that fact. The hon. gentleman is in the habit, as every hon. member in this House knows, of making most offensive interruptions while other hon. gentlemen are speaking, and the hon. member is not willing to allow reciprocity, even in the smallest degree; because he will not allow any other hon. gentleman to ask him a simple question which may be germane to his remark, and may be intended for the purpose of eliciting information. I think the hon. gentleman departs from the usual course in both ways. First in offensively interrupting other speakers, and next in declining to answer fair and reasonable questions which are asked of himself when speaking. I have heretofore attributed it to the hon.

gentleman's temperament. He is of a somewhat excitable temperament, if he will allow me to say so, as he is in the habit of discussing my character and temper in the House. I think the hon. gentleman is of a somewhat excitable temperament; and I have been charitable enough to assume that he has acted simply on the impulse of the moment, and that he has not realized how unpleasant his interruptions were, and how very disagreeable his remarks occasionally were to those to whom they were addressed. But the hon. gentleman has not that excuse to-day. We have the fact of the hon. gentleman coming in here with a deliberately prepared speech, and beginning that speech with a deliberate insult to a member who had spoken on a previous occasion. The hon. gentleman began his speech by referring in language the taste of which was as bad as its English, to my "unable" effort on a previous occasion, and to the fact that I had been "floundering." I could understand the hon. gentleman getting up immediately after I had done and making that remark, but speaking that way in cold blood after the lapse of 24 hours is a thing that does very little credit to the hon. gentleman's heart, whatever it may do to his head. Then the hon. gentleman said before he closed that I had made a statement without any authority. I do not think that I am very often convicted here or elsewhere of making unfounded statements, and I say with regard to that statement as to the non-payment of contractors for work done on the Pacific Railway North of Lake Superior, that I have the very best authority. Those statements have been made in the press, and have not been denied. I have the authority of men who have been here in Ottawa for weeks and months waiting for their money, and have been unable to get it, and that is the very best authority. So far for the hon. gentleman and the personal statements in which he has been kind enough to refer to me. The hon. gentleman dealt at considerable length with the whole question of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman except as to two or three points. As to the Kicking Horse Pass, he said the company had secured the services of one of the best mountain engineers in the world, Major Rogers. I do not take Major Rogers' character on the hon. gentleman's authority. People are to be judged by their acts, and we do not know very much about Major Rogers here in Canada. We know however that the pass which he professed to have discovered had been discovered years ago; that in the first place it had been partially examined by Mr. Moberly, on behalf of British Columbia, as far back as 1865: and that it had been examined in 1874 by Mr. Moberly for the Government of Canada, and was condemned at the time. The Yellow Head Pass had been carefully examined by the Canadian Government engineers and had been approved of. The Canadian Government—the Government of the hon. gentleman's friends as well as the Government of the gentleman whom I followed—had caused very careful surveys to be made, and they had deliberately, after years of consideration, selected the route of the road, and that selection had been embodied in a statute—not an Order-in-Council, but a statute. Now, at the suggestion of this American engineer, who was, probably, anxious to figure as a discoverer, they select, without sufficient consideration, the Kicking Horse Pass. I do not profess to know as much about railways as the hon. gentleman from Niagara, but I feel satisfied at this moment that if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were back where they were before the Kicking Horse Pass was selected, they would not select that pass, but would adhere to the pass which had been selected by the Canadian Government engineers. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should be so anxious to decry our engineers, and to give the country to understand that after years of patient investigation they knew nothing about the proper pass through the mountains, but that this distinguished American, who came among us as the hon. gentleman has come, I presume, for our good, and actuated simply by a desire for the good of Canada, was the only one who could discover it. Then, the hon. member, in speaking about the wisdom and skill which characterize the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, forgot to refer to their wonderful feat of paying two and a quarter millions to build the Algoma branch, and then allowing that branch to

remain idle for a whole year. That is a kind of wisdom, shrewdness and capacity which, I confess my humble inability to admire or appreciate. The hon. gentleman, in order to confirm what he said about the discovery by this American engineer of the route by the Kicking Horse Pass, told us that several American engineers approved of that pass. I can quite understand it; they were patriotic men, and did not wish to have a Canadian railway better located than their own, and they naturally felt pleased that an American engineer had selected a pass which would seriously damage the Canadian Transcontinental Railway in comparison with their own. It is quite natural; and, perhaps, if the hon. gentleman had been a United States engineer he would have approved of it also on the same ground. Then the hon. member told us, in that way he has of telling us, as if nobody had ever heard of anything before he announced it, that it is not the through traffic, but the way traffic which builds up a railway. I was rather under the impression that that was a rudimentary principle now in railway operations; but I should like to ask the leader of the hon. gentleman why it is, if the through traffic is a matter of such small moment and the way traffic is of so great consequence, that the Government laid such stress upon the completion of this road in a hurry—why the Government made it a matter of such vast consequence that the line should be open for traffic in 1886, instead of 1891? That is a question that would naturally suggest itself. The reason given in another place was to get the through Asiatic trade at once. I allow the hon. gentleman to settle that with his leaders. The hon. gentleman referred to a very good thing—that the company had wonderfully brilliant prospects. The only comment I make on that is this—that if the company's prospects are so good, and their property is so valuable, it is a strange thing that they should have to come here to ask us to advance them more money. That is a sort of thing which, I venture to say, no one can quite understand. Then the hon. gentleman, referring, I think, to the language of gentlemen in another place, spoke of the injury that had been done to the Canadian Pacific Railway from the beginning, by the misrepresentation of the Opposition. As I ventured to say yesterday, in that floundering speech which I made, inasmuch as this misrepresentation had consisted in stating that the company had too good a bargain, it is not easy to see how that could injure their prospects in the money markets of the world. That is another inconsistency which the hon. gentleman and his leader may reconcile. Then, the hon. member devoted a good deal of his time to discussing the grinding monopoly; there was very little said about the monopoly this year, in this House, at any rate. He also pointed out clearly and well the unique advantages which this Canadian Pacific Railway possesses in owning a road which extends from ocean to ocean, it being the only railway company owning such a line. Then again the inquiry naturally suggests itself, why is it that this Company, with these unique advantages, is obliged to come to us and ask for an advance of $5,000,000? That is a question which cannot be answered and has not been answered. The hon. gentleman intimated that it was an outrageous thing to contend, as it was contended here yesterday by some members of this House, that the company should not be allowed to select their own terminus. I do not think it was contended yesterday by anyone that the company should not be allowed to extend their road beyond Port Moody if they pleased. The only contention was that the Government should not be a party to that transaction, and that if they erected terminal buildings they should be at the place where the Government by Statute and by Orders-in-Council having the force of Statutes, fixed the terminus. The hon. gentleman, not dealing with what was before us, but going back, as the hon. gentleman is so fond of doing, to old times to have a blow at men who are not responsible for what is being done now, and who if they sinned or erred have paid the panalty of their sin or mistake, told us about the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway through the narrows of Lake Manitoba. I am not denying that that location was a mistake, and of course the Prime Minister of the day was responsible for the location in a sense, but that location was not made by that hon. gentleman. It was made by his chief engineer, and

the mistake that the Premier of that day made was in placing too implicit confidence in the judgment of his engineers. But the hon gentleman when he was dealing with the mistakes in location might have come a little further down in the history of the road and taken something that was done by his own friends. We remember that after the change of Government took place, there was a great deal said about the folly of this location through the narrows of Lake Manitoba, and the Minister of Railways of that day, who is now High Commissioner in England, undertook to build, and did lay down 100 miles of Government railway west of Winnipeg. What was the character of that road? Was it much better than the road through the Narrows would have been? Not at all; because as soon as the frost went out of the ground the rails and sleepers on that portion of the road constructed by the Government, of which the hon. gentleman is a supporter, sank into the soft marshy soil, and the first thing that the Canadian Pacific Company did when they came in, or almost the first thing, was to take up such rails as could be recovered and build the road elsewhere. I do not think in the matter of locating the Pacific Railway in Manitoba the hon. gentleman's friends have much more reason to congratulate themselves than my friends have. The hon. member referred to attacks made on the North-West and its capabilities. I have listened with reasonable attention to the debates in this House, and I do not remember that I have ever heard anyone say anything against the soil, climate or capabilities of the North-West territory. A good deal has been said about the way in which the Government had mal-administered the affairs of that territory. But nothing has been said against the territory itself. Then the hon. gentleman, in a fit of virtuous indignation, talked about the atrocity (that is what one would gather from his words) of attempting to violate a contract made with the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. POWER—I discussed that matter in what my hon. friend was pleased to characterize as my floundering way; and I shall not dwell upon it again; but if the hon. gentleman has such regard for the sanctity of contracts, why is it that, when a vote was taken yesterday on an amendment to prevent the violation of a solemn decision as to the location of the western terminus, the hon. gentleman voted to repudiate that contract and damage people who are not shareholders in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but who are good, law-abiding, loyal and British subjects.

HON. MR. McINNES—Only poor citizens.

HON. MR. POWER—Then the hon. gentleman, in that way which is so familiar to us, talked about how the country had approved of the conduct of the present Government, and how the country would—and he spoke quite positively on this point—give a verdict in their favor when an opportunity occurred. The hon. gentleman may or may not be right as to what the result of the next election may be; but he must remember that the country will not have an opportunity of giving a free, open and untramelled verdict upon the conduct of the present Government; because the Government have taken care so to alter the election law that the verdict will be not altogether the verdict of the country, but to a large extent the verdict of the officers appointed by the Government. I hope the House will pardon me for having trespassed so long on their time in replying to the hon. gentleman. I wish now to be allowed to say just a few words with reference to this amendment which I now propose:—

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House, for the purpose of adding the following clause:—

"Notwithstanding anything in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1884, or any amendment thereto, the lien of the Government on the Canadian Pacific Railway shall apply to and include any extension of the said railway to English Bay or Coal Harbor."

The fairness of that, I think, must be evident, for the reasons that were urged yesterday in discussing the matter by other hon. gentlemen more than by myself; but there is this additional reason to which I do not think attention was called. If the railway is extended to English Bay or

Coal Harbor, and the terminal buildings are erected there, hon. gentlemen will see that the terminus at Port Moody, upon which the Government now have a lien, will become of much less value than it is at present, and that the value of the government lien on the road will be diminished to the extent of the decrease in value of the property at Port Moody. If the terminal buildings which the Government propose to erect at Port Moody shall be erected at another point, and the value which the works at Port Moody would have given that place shall have been taken away from it and added to the value of the Company's works at another point, I think it is only reasonable that the Government and the country should have a lien on the works at the other point. I think that is perfectly clear, and I trust that the Government will have no objection to make this amendment to the Bill.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I have not considered this motion carefully, but I understood the Minister of Justice to say yesterday in reply to a question put by the hon. gentleman from New Brunswick (Mr. Dever) that the lien of the Government would extend to that portion of the road west of Port Moody.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMBPELL—Yes, as I will explain in a moment.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Therefore, if that would be the case I do not see the necessity for such an amendment.

I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate now by any extended remarks. I am a staunch and earnest supporter of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as much so as any member of this House, and I think the prosperity of the country largely depends on the success of that enterprise. I do not wish to remark on what the hon. member from Niagara stated with regard to the extension of the road to Coal Harbour. I think it would have been just as well if he had omitted any remark in relation to that subject from the speech which he made, considering all the circumstances and the discussion we had the other day, but I cannot help saying a few words in reply to the speech of my hon. friend the senior member from Halifax. If I understood him right, he said that as far as the Yellow Head Pass was concerned it could not be expected that any engineer from the United States of such note would be likely to report in favor of the best route, considering that he would then be approving of a railway which would be a successful rival of the trans-continental lines in the United States.

HON. MR. POWER—I did not say that at all.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It cannot be that an engineer of any reputation would be biased in that way and make a wrong report, or one inconsistent with his engineering skill and interest, and report in favor of a route which was not the best, simply because by doing so he would make the Canadian road inferior to competing lines in the United States. I I think that is the line of argument that my hon. friend used.

HON. MR. POWER—No.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Well, it was tantamount to that. I do not think that any engineer would do a thing of that kind. My hon. friend talked about completing this road in six years before the appointed time, 1891. That, I think, is something which will benefit this country to a greater extent than my hon. friend appreciates. To my mind it is six years gained in the settlement and development of the North-West Territories, which is of incalculable value to the Dominion. It is six years gained in the immigration into this country instead of allowing it to go to the United States and other countries. It means six years of profit on the investment we have made in the North-West. These three reasons, independent of any other are, to my mind, in themselves conclusive that this railway should be completed in the interests of our country as rapidly as possible. My hon. friend fails to see why the company should come to Parliament for more money. It is well known that this work has been retarded not only by rival railway companies, such as the Grand Trunk Railway, but the route selected, the land through which it passes, the character of the work, the climate—all were decried, not only abroad but even in this House,

and my hon. friend has gone very far in that direction himself. He not only did that, but while this company were on their way to England to borrow money he told us that they were bankrupt and could not pay their workmen, and that their paper is now floating at a discount in the money markets of Canada. Do not statements such as these, coming from an important member of the Senate, made solemnly on the floor of Parliament, affect the credit of the Company?

HON. MR. POWER—Not the slightest.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am sorry if my hon. friend thinks that his statements are of no importance, and that if they are carried across the Atlantic by persons who are antagonistic to the Canadian Pacific Railway they will have no effect. They have had effect and they have tended to hamper the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the money market and prevent them fulfilling their contract at an early day. My hon. friend says that these men spent no money on the Canadian Pacific Railway proper. I believe they have spent $10,000,000 of their own money independent of the money they have spent on the branches. I have from a member of the Syndicate, one of the directors, himself, a statement that he has put millions of his own money into the enterprise. It has been proved clearly by the leader of the Government here that all the money advanced by the country has been expended for work upon the main line. My hon. friend talked about the Algoma branch and the money invested in it lying idle. In answer to that I might talk about the steel rails lying idle and rusting in British Columbia.

HON. MR. POWER—You did talk enough about that at the time.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I might talk about the Fort Frances Lock and Neebing Hotel lying worse than idle—never to be used. The Algoma branch will probably be used before another year. My hon. friend talked about 100 miles of track west of Winnipeg having been laid on such marshy ground that it was found necessary to transfer the rails to another place at an enormous expense. I am not aware that any such length of track had to be shifted, but if I have been correctly informed on that point they were merely shifted from where they were laid originally to a track near by and running parallel to it. They were laid on the open prairie and no grading or ballasting had been done, and probably the shifting of the track did not cost $100 altogether.

HON. MR. POWER—Oh no.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Well, I cannot say what it cost, but it could not have been a large sum. My hon. friend talks about this trunk line and the company having lost money by not confining itself to the construction of the main line itself. Had the Canadian Pacific Railway Company not been able to show in England that they had connections with large centres they could not have borrowed money. You might as well talk of a tree without branches, as a railway without connections—it would be dead and useless without them. The Directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with far-seeing eye to the future traffic of the road, endeavored as quickly as possible to make connections and secure branch lines in order that they might have independent lines to reach the different provinces. Will my hon. friend tell me that the Maritime Provinces would have been content if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had been satisfied to stop at Callander and to permit the traffic to go anywhere and everywhere and be absorbed by the United States? No, the Maritime Provinces took up this matter as a great national question, and believed that the Atlantic coast would receive equal benefits with the Pacific coast from the construction of the line. To tell me that this Company should confine its operations west of Callander seems to me to be madness, and not in the interest of the Maritime Provinces. We want all the branches; we believe this road should run from Louisburg to the Pacific. Without that you cannot get the sympathy of the Maritime Provinces in favor of this road. You must convince them that is to be a purely Canadian enterprise, independent of any foreign connection. That is the road we want for Canada, and the only road that we care to aid; it is

the one which will develop the resources of this country, and the one which the people are willing to assist, as far as possible, to create and maintain. Therefore my hon. friend, when he denounces the Canadian Pacific Railway for not having confined all their means and energy to a dead trunk line without branches, is not advocating what is in the interest of the Lower Provinces, because, as I said before—and I want to impress it upon this House—if we found the Canadian Pacific Railway Company stopping at Callander and allowing other lines to tap it and carry the trade to a foreign country, diverting it from its natural course, the Maritime Provinces would take a different position from that which they occupy to-day. They sustain the Government in their policy of completing the road, because the country is committed to it and we cannot do anything else. We look upon the Canadian Pacific Railway enterprise as a source of great wealth and prosperity to the Dominion. Altogether in lands and money it will have cost the country only $55,000,000, for which we are receiving full value. Therefore I cannot agree with those who say that the railway should not be extended east of Callander. It is important for the people who raise the grain in the west to know that we have an independent line by which they can ship their products to the sea-board and what it will cost them for freight. I cannot sit here in silence listening to hon. gentlemen decrying this great Railway enterprise, retarding its progress and prosperity, and lessening its chances of becoming a great highway in the hands of one company, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

HON. MR. CARVELL—While endorsing the remarks of my hon. friend from Lunenburg in reference to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway from ocean to ocean, I must say I was struck with the fact that though he, with many other Nova Scotians, very properly wished some time ago that Halifax should be the winter terminus of the line, he is now willing that the road should be extended as far as Louisburg. If that is desirable in the east, why not in all fairness allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to go to English Bay—a little further west as well as a little further east?

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I have no objection to the Canadian Pacific Railway going to English Bay, but I say, so far as we are concerned, the terminus is fixed at Port Moody, and we cannot properly expend money in erecting buildings anywhere else. The Government are bound to construct buildings at the point fixed by Act of Parliament and by Orders-in-Council and, as the contract requires, at Port Moody.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—I think it is the duty of this, or any Government, to come to the aid of any public undertaking when it is neccessary, and I do not think the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company comes to us for assistance is in any way an evidence that the security which it offers is not sufficient to guarantee perfectly the present arrangement. The argument which was used by my hon. friend on the other side might be directed against any wealthy corporation, and even the wealthiest countries. It might even be used against the Empire of England. It might be asked, at sometime in the history of the empire how is it that the Government of England cannot pay its debts without borrowing money? The same thing might happen capitalists and the most powerful banks. It often happens that the strongest financial institutions are obliged to come to the Government for temporary aid. I repeat it is in the public interest that under such circumstances as these the Government should aid these national institutions as far as possible. Now as to the present position of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I do not consider the fact of the shares not having been sold at a reasonable price, or loans not having been contracted in the European markets is any evidence that they had not sufficient security to offer the Government for the assistance which they are asking. It is well known that this is a new country, and our national enterprise is of such a character, and is being built so speedily that we had not sufficient time to have it fully appreciated by the great capitalists of the world. It is quite natural that capitalists should say, if the Pacific Railway Company have sufficient to show and sufficient to guarantee what they are asking in the money markets, why do they not go to their own Government, and

why should not their Government guarantee them the money, because the Government is in a better position to appreciate their financial conditiou than outsiders would be? I consider that under those circumstances the Government had better guarantee the loan which is asked for by the Canadian Pacific Railway, because, if I understand the transaction, the Government will improve their own position by the change of security. We have no difficulty in concluding that there is no reasonable apprehension as to this transaction. I consider it in the same light as a loan which would be made to a farmer. A capitalist being asked for $1,000 by a farmer to make improvements on his farm which is valued at $2,000 he would at once loan $1,000 on that security. Then the farmer would give a mortgage on the whole property, and it would be considered at the time that the loan would not be too much for the security. But after this $1,000 is spent on the farm, if it is judiciously expended, then the farm has an increased value of at least $1,000. The creditor is then in this position, having as security for his loan of $1,000 not only the farm valued at $2,000 but the improvements, in all a value of $3,000. Then supposing the farmer would come again and say, "Last year you gave me $1,000 on the security of my farm. Now my property has been increased in value by that $1,000; I require some more money, say $500. If you cannot lend it to me, I want you to consent to allow some other creditor to come in and take security for a loan of $500. I think the creditor would consent to advance another $500 on that security, or allow the farmer to obtain it from someone else on a second mortgage. I consider the present transaction with the Pacific Railway Company of the same character. It is true that in one sense the whole transaction is remodelled, and in such a manner as to leave the Government all that security which is reasonably sufficient to put them in such a position as to have every possible assurance that they will not lose one cent by this loan to the Company. I may say that I have some apprehension about these matters, but it is not at all in relation to this transaction. I believe it has been very often said in this House that we are giving very great advantages to the Pacific Railway Company. To a certain extent I believe it is the case, but in the meantime I do not think it is possible to do better, and what I am about to say is not in reply to the arguments of political opponents, but from a consideration of the whole matter. In case it should be true that we are dealing too liberally with the Pacific Railway Company, the fault lies on those who seven or eight years ago were continually announcing to the country that it was an absurdity to undertake such a vast enterprise as the building of a railway from ocean to ocean. We all recollect that not long ago when the North-West Territories were purchased for the trifling sum of $300,000 it was denounced all over the country as a waste of public money; that it was an extravagance that the country would never recover from. What was the consequence of those two assertions that it was absurd to undertake such a great enterprise as the Pacific Railway, and that the country would never recover from the burden they were assuming, coupled with the contention that it was a mistake to have acquired the North-West? The consequence was that the people in the mother country were inclined to undervalue or depreciate those immense territories which we had acquired. But this was not the worst consequence of it. It resulted in a want of confidence not only amongst foreign capitalists, but even amongst our statesmen in the future of our country. The hon. gentleman will recollect very well that in 1875, 1876, 1877, and even in 1878 here, in this very House, when the representatives of the Province of Quebec were pressing upon the Government the necessity for building the branch from Thunder Bay to Callander, the leader of the Government in this House used to say, and it was repeated a dozen times, and it is on record in the official report of our debates, that it is such an absurd enterprise for this country to undertake to build a railway across the continent at this period of its history that our grandchildren would hardly see the realization of the project.

HON. MR. POWER—Could the hon. gentleman point out the relevancy of the

remarks he is making now to the amendment which I proposed?

HON. MR. TRUDEL—I was stating that the hon. member for Ottawa in 1876 and 1877 said that the country north of Lake Superior was such an inhospitable country that it was impossible to build a railway through there, and that it was absurd to undertake the building of a road across the continent.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman misapprehends my remark. I have moved an amendment which affects the extension of the line from Port Moody west to English Bay, and I asked my hon. friend what bearing his remarks have on the question which is before the House?

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Before I rose to make the few remarks I have made, it was my impression that the motion of the hon. gentleman should be disposed of before we got to the merits of the Bill, but the House knows very well the course followed. We discussed the whole matter in committee in detail, and afterwards when we came to a vote on the third reading we took up the discussion of the main question. I followed the example of the hon. gentleman who had preceded me. He did not discuss the amendment of my hon. friend, and I thought it was understood that the whole question could be discussed on the third reading.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I wish to say a word in regard to this amendment. It will be in the recollection of the House that I called attention to the point yesterday and expressed a doubt as to the security that the country was to have on these explanations which are to be made. I expressed that doubt in the form of an enquiry of the leader of the Government for information, and I received the answer which referred me to the 14th section of the agreement which is incorporated in the Act of Parliament in 1881. I had not had the opportunity to study the Act, but I have taken the trouble to look at it since, and as regards that particular section of the articles of incorporation which are ratified by the Act, it does not seem to apply to this question at all because it is merely applying to branches; but when I looked at the 15th section of the articles of incorporation on page 19 I find that the point is made apparently very clear. But to show that this question of the extension of the railway was not embraced in that 14th section it goes on to add "And any extensions of the said line of railway that shall hereafter be constructed or equipped by the company shall constitute the line of railway hereinafter called the Canadian Pacific Railway." That makes the point very clear that this extension, if made, will form naturally and necessarily a part of the main line of the company; but, lest there should be any doubt on that, I observe, on referring to the Act of last year, cap. 1, section 5, which is the point in discussion, that provision is made to meet a case of this kind. As I understand by the amendment which was suggested by the hon. leader of the House, this afternoon, it is intended to remove any doubt as to this preferential lien being placed in the same position as the lien under the Act of last year. I merely call attention to the section to show that by the Act of last year, the lien covered the main line of railway, and any extensions thereof.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend from Amherst has made part of the explanation I intended to make, and I have only to add one or two sentences to it. In this very Bill that is now before us for a third reading, the same thing is repeated as plainly as possible, and I think, when I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to it, he will not consider it necessary to proceed with his amendment. This very Bill provides that the $5,000,000 loan shall

> constitute, and be a first lien and charge on the entire property of the country, real and personal, now owned, or hereafter to be acquired or owned, by it (save and except the lands granted, or to be granted, by the Government to the company, under the contract between Her Majesty and the company, and the Acts relating thereto), including its main line of railway, with its tolls and revenues, the extension thereof, its branch lines of railway (except the Algoma branch), the whole of its equipment, rolling stock and plant, and all its steamers and vessels.

It is just as strong as the amendment can be, and coming on top of the language which the hon. gentleman from

Amherst has quoted from the Act, there can be no possible doubt on the question.

HON. MR. POWER—Under the circumstances I beg leave to withdraw the amendment.

By the consent of the House the amendment was withdrawn.

THE SPEAKER—The motion is now on the third reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. McINNES moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that the said Bill be amended by adding to it the following clause :—

CLAUSE A.—"In case the company, by any extension of its main line, or by the construction of any branch line or lines, or by any agreement for acquiring or leasing the line or lines of any other railway company or companies, or by any agreement for running powers over the line or lines of any other railway company or companies, or by traffic arrangements with any other railway company or companies, or by any other means or device, establish (or purpose to establish) a terminus on the Pacific coast at any point other than Port Moody, then the Government of Canada shall not construct or establish any such terminus, nor along the line or lines of railway whereby the Canadian Pacific Railway is connected or proposed to be connected with such terminus, the engine house, station buildings and water service, which, by contract and agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company approved and ratified by the Act passed in the forty-fourth year of Her Majesty's reign, Chaptered One, the Government is bound to construct, establish and convey to the company, upon the completion of the Eastern and Central Sections of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but the said engine house, station buildings and water service shall be constructed and established at Port Moody, notwithstanding the establishment or proposed establishment of any other terminus."

This is substantially the same motion that I moved in the Committee yesterday, and as that motion was pretty fully discussed, I do not propose taking up any more of the time of the House. As far as the Bill itself is concerned, I thought of entering into a discussion and refuting what appeared to my mind to be a great number of erroneous and wild statements that have been made to-day; but perhaps enough has been said on that subject, and I only hope that the sanguine expectations expressed here by a great number of hon. gentlemen will be realized. That is my sincere hope. You will see by this amendment that I ask for nothing but what is perfectly fair and legitimate—what was promised by the Government, promised by Order-in-Council, promised by Act of Parliament, and promised by and contained in the agreement with the Pacific Railway. Nearly all the terminal facilities are at Port Moody now with the water service. We have had large storehouses built by the Government there: we have a station house that will serve a very good purpose for a number of years, and I appeal to this House once more that the Government shall go to work and build the ten-stall engine house for which they called for tenders on two or three different occasions—at least twice to my knowledge. I ask for that, and in doing so I ask for nothing but what the Government are in duty bound to give to keep faith with the people who invested on the strength of the solemn promises and pledges made by the government to the country.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I hope that I may be able to persuade the hon. gentleman from New Westminster to withdraw this amendment. It is really suggesting that the Government is about to do or can do an illegal thing. It is asking the House, if the House is of the same opinion as the hon. gentleman, to vote on the supposition that the Government can do and will do an illegal thing. The Government had a contract with the Pacific Railway Company to build the road to the Pacific coast. They ultimately selected Port Moody as the point on the Pacific to which the railway was to extend. They are bound by that. They have no right to go beyond that. They have no right to spend a dollar of the public money beyond that point in terminal buildings, and why it is assumed that they are going to put up buildings illegally without authority, and the House to be asked in advance of this illegal thing to say that they shall not do it, is a matter I cannot understand. No Government with any self-respect would submit to be placed in such a position—that they intend to do illegal things. No government in Canada will set to work to do such a thing. The Government has no legal right to do so.

Supposing we asked for power to erect those buildings west of Port Moody, then would be the time to reject the Bill and to say "no, we are not going to give you that power; the terminus is at Port Moody and you have no right to go beyond that and we do not want you to spend any money beyond Port Moody. The great object of the country in giving those millions is to establish a connection with the Pacific Ocean, and that object once accomplished the railway is finished."

HON. MR. POWER—Will the Minister of Justice explain on what authority the Government allowed the Pacific Railway Company to select Kicking Horse Pass after the line was located through Yellow Head Pass.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The law was changed in that respect and the Company were allowed to change the location.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I quite agree with what my hon. friend the leader of the Government has said that the Government will not do an illegal thing, but they will put the buildings up where the law directs. What the people who have invested at Port Moody on the strength of the pledge of the Government that the terminus would be there say is, that tenders were out for the buildings at Port Moody, and they were withdrawn. Tenders were received for the work, and we understand from high authority that those tenders were not accepted in consequence of the Pacific Railway Company intending to extend the line down to English Bay, and it would be very much left to their disposal to say where the terminal buildings would be.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No contract has been given out, and that is all that can be said about it.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Tenders came in, and none of them was accepted in consequence of the Pacific Railway Company's interference. We know that the Pacific Railway Company is a powerful corporation, and we know the influence it has—a very proper influence I hope, and for my part I do not believe that the Government will do anything but put the buildings at Port Moody; but when we see the tenders abandoned and members are told that it is in consequence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's influence it is sufficient to raise a doubt as to what the result may be.

HON. MR. McINNES—The Minister of Justice says that it would be absurd for me to ask the Government to do anything illegal. I am not desirous to place the Government in that position, but if it were legal for them to call for tenders for the erection of those buildings at Port Moody, I ask this House if it is illegal for them to erect the buildings there now?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend does not understand it. We do not do anything below Port Moody: we do it at Port Moody.

HON. MR. McINNES—The meaning I attach to the amendment is, that the terminal buildings shall be built at Port Moody—that is the engine house: as far as other buildings are concerned they are not referred to in that amendment.

The House divided on the amendment which was lost on the following division:

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Armand,	McInnes, (New Westminster),
Bellerose,	Pâquet,
Guévremont,	Pelletier,
Haythorne,	Power,
Kaulbach,	Stevens,—12.
Leonard,	
McClelan,	

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Allan,	Macdonald, (Victoria),
Almon,	MacInnes, (Burlington)
Bolduc,	Miller (Speaker),
Boucherville de,	Montmagny,
Campbell, (Sir Alex.),	Nelson,
Carvell,	O'Donohoe,
Clemow,	Plumb,
DeBlois,	Read,
Dickey,	Robitaille,
Girard,	Schultz,
Howlan,	Smith,
McKay,	Trudel,
McKindsey,	Vidal.—27.
McMillan,	

HON. MR. McINNES moved in amend ment:—

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that the said Bill be amended by adding thereto the following as Clause A :—

"*Clause A.*

"Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any Act relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Company shall not by any extension of its main line, nor by the construction of any branch line or lines, or by the purchase, lease or other acquisition of any line or lines of any other railway company, nor by any agreement for running arrangements over the line of any other railway company, nor in any other manner whatsoever, remove the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from Port Moody to Coal Harbor or to English Bay, or establish its terminus at Coal Harbor or at English Bay, within a period of ten years from the passing of this Act."

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—For my part I cannot accede to this amendment, because, as the Minister of Justice said a moment ago, the law provides that the terminus shall be at Port Moody, and as long as that is in the law I believe the amendment is not necessary ; but having voted for it yesterday I voted for it to-day on the same principle. Now the position is changed. The law says that Port Moody is the terminus, but it might happen later on that circumstances would force the Government, in the interests of the Company, to change the terminus, and I do not want to prevent the Government from coming before this House and asking a change if it should be necessary.

The amendment was declared lost on the same division.

HON. MR. POWER moved in amendment :—

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be further amended as follows :—

"Any improvements which may be made with a view of securing a harbor at Coal Harbor or English Bay, British Columbia, shall be made at the expense of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It cannot be made at the expense of anybody else.

The amendment was declared lost on a division.

THE SPEAKER—The motion is now on the third reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—It has repeatedly been stated in this House that two great advantages have been conferred upon the country by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is well known that the condition on which the loan was granted last year, was, that it should be final, and that if the company failed to fulfil its obligations the Government might resume possession of the railway. As I have already stated, what is proposed here considerably alters the position of the country. I think we have as much security as before. It is my impression that the time is not far distant when Canada, like a great many other countries of the world, will be obliged to buy up all the railways within its borders. The time will come when, if these roads are not taken possession of by the country, the two leading corporations may unite and become more powerful than the Government itself, and the government of the country would become entirely impossible. It may be said that there is a law on the Statute book which prevents the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from uniting. They cannot unite, it is true, while that law is in existence, but if an agreement were made between the two companies it would be very easy for them to use their influence to have it repealed. There are public reasons which have induced governments in Europe to take possession of the railways. Supposing such a necessity should arise in Canada, then the Dominion would find itself in this position : It would be obliged to pay perhaps $200,000,000 to buy a railway towards the construction of which the country has contributed nine tenths, or something more, of the original cost. The country will come to the conclusion that the advantages they derive from the Canadian Pacific Railway have not been as great as the cost, and at a certain period—and this is the point to which I wish to come—instead of giving greater facilities to the company, the Government should seek simply to adhere to the contract and say to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, "Since you are unable to carry on your undertaking we will take possession of the work." I have

no doubt if the Government proposed to take possession of the road as the property of the country now, very likely the majority of the people might refuse to sanction such a course. It was that reservation that I meant to make before voting on the amendment. If it had not been for the prejudices raised before 1878, and even since then, against that great national enterprise, the natural advantages which the company had received would, without doubt, have enabled them to borrow in the money markets all that was necessary to carry out their works, and there would be no necessity for them to make these applications to the country for aid. The position in which the Government are placed is due to the feeling which prevailed in the country and which was aroused in the manner I have described, so that I cannot blame the Government or the Company for the course which is being taken to-day. It is one of the consequences of what took place in the past. As the risk of the country is not augmented by this Bill, I see no reason why it should not pass.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

TIMBER CULLING BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of Bill (154) "An Act further to amend the Acts relating to the culling and measuring of timber in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec."

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

The Senate adjourned at 5.40 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Friday, July 17th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

A MORNING SITTING.

MOTION.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—In pursuance of the notice which I gave yesterday I beg to move that when this House adjourns to-day it do stand adjourned until to-morrow at 11 a.m.

HON. MR. POWER—Is it not sometimes provided that each sitting of the House shall count as a separate day?

THE SPEAKER—That can be done to-morrow with the consent of the House, if necessary.

The motion was agreed to.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PROVINCES AND TERRITORIES IN THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

MOTION WITHDRAWN.

HON. MR. MCINNES—As these may fairly be considered the dying hours of the session, I think it advisable, with the leave of the House, to withdraw this motion :—

That he will call the attention of this House to the fact that out of the seven Provinces and four Territories comprising the Dominion, only four Provinces are represented in the Queen's Privy Council of Canada, and the propriety of having each Province represented in our Privy Council.

I will bring it up on some future occasion.

The motion was withdrawn.

THE LATE SENATOR CHAPAIS.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the House adjourn during pleasure in order to enable Senators to attend the funeral of the late Hon. Mr. Chapais.

The motion was agreed to, and the House adjourned during pleasure.

At 5 p.m. the House was resumed.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We come from the solemn ceremony which we have just witnessed, with our

minds reverting to the virtues and he long service of our colleague, Mr. Chapais. He was a man for whom I had the keenest respect, and, I think, everyone who knew him must have participated in that feeling. He was a thoroughly worthy and upright man, and, I think, one of the best men I ever met. In saying that he was one of the best men, I mean he was one of the most pious men I ever met. I conceived from my first acquaintance with him the strongest regard for him. I knew him first in 1858, I think ; I afterwards served with him in the Government for some ten or twelve years, and in that way I became closely acquainted with his character, and to be closely acquainted with his character was, certainly, to respect and love him. I do not think anyone who knew him as intimately as I did could express his feelings in any less strong language. That was my feeling for the late Mr. Chapais. I heard, with great emotion, this morning of his sudden death ; it is a warning to me and to others who have served long in public life, entering into it, as I did, about the same time as he did, or a little later, that our days are passing away. From my intimate knowledge of his life and character I am quite sure that each of us may well exclaim, "May I die the death of the righteous, and may my latter end be like his."

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I am sure that we all share in the language expressed by the leader of the House, in speaking as he does of the late Mr. Chapais. I had also the pleasure of knowing him very intimately for a great number of years. My acquaintance with him dated from the long session of 1858, in Toronto. He then, being a vigorous and active man, spoke frequently and at length on all subjects in which the province of Quebec was interested. To know him was to feel that he was the possessor of just those qualities that my hon. friend has described —a high appreciation of integrity, a high sense of honor, and all those qualities which mark the true gentleman. His death was a shock to us all, because I think it was only Wednesday last that he was here participating in our proceedings and registering his vote in the Senate. As the leader of the House has said, it might be the desire of any of us to lead the life our late colleague led for very many years. Since he withdrew from the Government we know that in this House every act of his, every word he spoke, sprang from his own conscientious feeling of what was right to be said and done. He acted on the very highest principles that could guide the human mind, and therefore we may well desire, at our latter end, to feel that we are as ready to die as he was. I think no more fitting tribute could be paid to his memory than to say that none of us could wish to be called away, and feel more prepared to meet his God than he was.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL— Belonging to the same nationality as the late Mr. Chapais, perhaps it will not be out of place for me to express my high sense of grati tude for the honor paid to his memory by both leaders of this House. In the meantime, as you, hon. gentlemen, have known the lamented Senator as one of those who was most devoted to the nationality to which he belonged, allow me to say a few words in French. I think it is due to him that the euology should be pronounced in the language which he spoke during his lifetime. In his long public career he was known throughout the Dominion as a representative French-Canadian. He expressed the views and sentiments of those he represented: he maintained their rights and he protected the interests of the province from which he came. He was recognized in all parts of the country as the champion, *par excellence*, of true conservative principles. That he was influenced in all his acts by a spirit of justice and fair play is manifest from the recognition of those high qualities in his character by the leaders on both sides of the House to-day. The fact that the Senate, out of respect to his memory, adjourned to-day to attend his funeral and that the leaders on both sides have expressed their high appreciation of his sterling qualities must be a matter of gratification to all his old colleagues, and especially to those of his own nationality from the Province of Quebec. Permit me to express my gratitude for these tokens of respect for our departed friend and colleague, and the hearty concurrence manifested in the sentiments which have been express-

ed by the leaders on both sides of the House.

HON. MR. FLINT—I wish to bear my humble testimony to the worth of my late friend and colleague. I have known him about 20 years. We formed what I might consider an almost intimate friendship at the start of our acquaintance, and that friendship continued down almost to the day of his death. I saw him in the House some three or four days ago.

HON. MR. PLUMB—He was here on Wednesday.

HON. MR. FLINT—I spoke with him then and he seemed to be cheerful and in good health, and I little expected that he would have gone from amongst us so suddenly. Taking everything into consideration, his death is his gain, while it is our loss. I believe he was a man of sterling worth, I knew him to be a man of even temperament, always willing to do what he believed to be right, and I think we have lost a colleague whose place it will be hard to fill. I make these remarks because I feel deeply the loss of my old lamented friend, and my hope is that I shall meet him in a better world.

THE REBELLION IN THE NORTH-WEST.

MOTION.

The order of the day having been read,—

That the thanks of this House be tendered to Major-General Middleton, C.B., commanding the field force of the militia of Canada, and the officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the militia and of the mounted police force recently engaged in the suppression of the rebellion in the North-West Territories, for their eminent services whilst engaged on that duty, and to express the Senate's appreciation of the valour and conduct of those who have perished, and their sympathy with their relatives and friends.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL said: The duty which I rise to discharge is a novel one. No one in this generation of Canadians has ever had occasion to propose a vote of thanks to an army in the field, and, although ours has not been a very large one, it has done effective service, amply vindicating the motion which I now offer for the consideration of the House. In the midst of profound peace the Minister of Militia was called upon, without a day's warning to put into the field a considerable force of active militia. The news of the necessity of this step reached Ottawa on the 22nd of March. Under the vigorous administration of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia the Major-general commanding left for the scene of the disturbance on the following day. On the 24th orders were issued to several regiments to hold themselves in readiness to proceed to the North-West; on the 27th, the first detachment of troops left for Winnipeg, and they were followed up day by day by others until the force there had reached 4637 men, 473 horses and 8 guns. On the 3rd of April, the first detachment of troops reached Winnipeg, they had passed over 1305 miles of railway, and 80 or 90 miles of gaps, over which they had to march in the most inclement weather and over the worst possible roads. On the 24th of April, after another railway journey and nearly 200 miles of marching, they encountered the enemy at Fish Creek. The engagement at Batoche followed in a few days. The quickness with which this force was put into the field, a distance of 1500 or 1600 miles from headquarters; the thoroughness of its equipment; the quickness of its movements reflect the greatest credit on all concerned. The Major-General commanding had been selected by my hon. friend from amongst many in Her Majesty's army, well fitted to command her militia in this country. The wisdom of Mr. Caron's selection has been amply vindicated by the conduct of General Middleton in the field; by his wisdom in forming his plans, his skilfulness in conducting them to execution, and the great care which he manifested regarding the lives of those citizen soldiers entrusted to his care. In the earliest engagement at Fish Creek, the Major-General felt, I do not doubt, that it was necessary to set an example to the force under his command, composed, as it was, altogether of civilians who had never seen a shot fired in anger. His two aides-de-camp were wounded, and one had two horses shot under him, and the Major-General himself received a bullet through

his cap ; all showing that he had put himself perhaps unduly forward, and for the purpose, as I have no doubt, of stimulating his men by his own example. The fact that our troops behaved so well in the North-West and evinced such steady courage in the presence of the enemy, I dare say we owe much to General Middleton. From all that we know, it is impossible that troops could have been led with more judgment, or indeed with more gallantry. That they were able to take the field so quickly and so well equipped in every way, that their movements were so prompt and so complete, we owe chiefly, I beleive, to the vigorous administration of my hon. friend, the Minister of Militia, whose zeal and thoroughness and assiduity in the discharge of the novel and arduous duties which the circumstances threw upon him deserve the highest praise. He is not included in this vote of thanks, because it would not be usual to do so, but the country well knows, I think, that it is greatly his debtor in the matters to which I have referred, and I have every reason to believe that he was effectively seconded by Colonel Powell, Deputy Adjutant General, and Colonel Panet, Deputy Minister of Militia, and by the Director General of Stores, Lt.-Colonel Macpherson. The precautions which were taken to keep up the stores and ammunition by despatching large quantities from Ottawa through the United States the moment the troops left this part of the country showed great foresight and good management, whilst the hospital arrangements were exceedingly complete and effective. That service was placed under the command of Surgeon-General Bergin, and any one who has studied the details will arrive at the conclusion that he discharged it with foresight, and thoroughness, and sound judgment. The courage of our men was undoubted, and the expectations of the country in this respct have been amply realized ; but I don't think that anyone expected from the young recruits who formed the forces the powers of endurance which they displayed. They commenced the campaign at the worst possible period of the year as regards exposure to wet and the most trying kind of cold. In eight days they accomplished the distance from Ottawa to Winnipeg, including marches amounting to between 80 and 90 miles over very rough country, in snow and slush, one may safely say without roads. When they left Winnipeg early in April for the field the first detachment marched from Qu'Appelle were engaged in the skirmish at Fish Creek, where they were two days or three ; they defeated the enemy with considerable loss both there and in the affair at Batoche on the 8th of May, and arrived at Prince Albert in ten days, a distance of 196 miles, which was traversed by them, including the engagements I have spoken of, at the rate of 19 miles a day. The march of the column of Colonel Otter, from Battleford to Poundmaker's Reserve, a distance of 35 miles, and the return over the same distance after having defeated the enemy in a skirmish of five or six hours' duration, was a wonderful achievement for young troops. I am confident that the marching powers of the force would have received the praise of the most experienced officers. The gallantry and spirit with which they made the rush at Batoche on an enemy of unknown strength entrenched in a strong position, was a strong evidence of the high courage of the men and of the spirit with which they were led by Cols. Williams and Grasett. Since that engagement the country has to mourn the loss of one of those who took the foremost part in it—Col. Williams, of the Midland Battalion—a soldier of high courage and gallantry, whose name will live as one of the bravest and best soldiers who fought under General Middleton in the campaign. The Major-General, upon whom nothing seems to have been thrown away, relates in his dispatch a little anecdote which I will repeat to the House. It is in the account of the battle of Fish Creek. He says : " I cannot conclude " without mentioning a little bugler of the " 90th Regiment, who made himself par- " ticularly useful in carrying ammunition " to the right flank when the fire was very " hot. This he did with peculiar non- " chalance, walking calmly about, crying " 'now boys, who's for cartridges ?' " The little fellow's name is William Buchanan, and it will also have a place in the history of this campaign. The hospital service, under the charge of Dr. Roddick, Deputy Surgeon-General, and our colleague, Dr. Sullivan, as pur-

veyor-general, was admirably conducted, and they were assisted in the most efficient manner by a number of ladies, most or all of whom were Sisters of Charity, or of the order of St. John the Divine; and that constant friend of Canada Her Royal Highness Princess Louise, foremost as she has ever been when any good work was to be done for this country, sent out many hospital stores, and a surgeon of her own selection, for the purpose of dispensing them. Nothing was wanting to the comfort of those who were wounded or ill and in hospital from other causes, and it will be a source of pleasure to the House to learn that the recoveries were remarkable, owing chiefly, no doubt, to skilful medical attendance and good nursing, and partly perhaps to the climate where the operations were being conducted. The commissariat service was placed chiefly with the Hudson's Bay Company, and I observe that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia speaks of the officer who had charge of it, Mr. J. Wrigley, in the highest terms, and says that his activity and zeal and tact did him honour. While all behaved so well it would be invidious to mention individuals, nor is it usual, and therefore this vote of thanks is confined by name to General Middleton; and all the others deeply and justly entitled to the thanks of the country are grouped under the ordinary phrase of officers and men, including the North-West Mounted Police who did excellent service there, although the main body was for a long time obliged to remain inactive at Prince Albert, but a detachment did excellent service at Battleford, and the advance upon Poundmaker and elsewhere in that, and other sections of the country. This House, however, will, I am sure, grant me its pardon in so far departing from the rule I have adverted to as to do it as well as myself the pleasure of referring to the gallant services of Lieut. Pelletier, the son of our colleague, the hon. member for Grandville (Mr. Pelletier,) who was wounded in the advance under Col. Otter upon Poundmaker. Happily he has recovered, and is now, I believe, on his way home with the Quebec *Voltigeurs*. I congratulate my hon. friend upon having a son who has so well discharged his duty, and of whom he has such just reason to be proud. I move with every confidence, hon. gentlemen :—

1. That the thanks of this House be given to Major-General Frederick D. Middleton, C.B., for the distinguished skill and ability with which he conducted the military operations in the North-West Territories, which resulted in the suppression of the rebellion against the authority of Her Majesty.

2. That this House doth acknowledge and highly approve the gallantry, discipline and good conduct displayed by the officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the Militia Force of Canada and of the North-West Mounted Police in the suppression of the said rebellion.

3. That this House doth acknowledge with admiration the distinguished valor and conduct of those who perished during the operations in the North-West in the service of their country, and desires to express its deep sympathy with their relatives and friends.

4. That Mr. Speaker do communicate said resolution to Major-General Frederick Middleton, and that he be requested by Mr. Speaker to signify the same to the several officers and men referred to therein.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I am sure, hon. gentlemen, that there can be but one feeling in this chamber on the propriety of this motion. The Canadian troops, under Major-General Middleton, have promptly and successfully quelled the insurrection in the North-West, and it is a fitting tribute that the Parliament of Canada should offer this vote of thanks. In the Imperial Parliament we know that votes of thanks of this kind are of frequent occurrence. The leader of the Government, in introducing these resolutions to our notice, remarked the few occasions, if any, on which a proposition of this kind has been submitted to Parliament. I do not, myself, recollect any occasion on which we have been asked to put on record a vote of thanks to a Canadian army. When the occasion did arise to call forth our militia and test the courage of Canadian troops it has been gratifying to see how our citizen soldiers have established their claim to the good opinion of us all. (Cheers.) When Parliament met in January, none of us had the most remote conception that there was a domestic warfare looming up in the distance, and we were all shocked when the news reached us of the occurrence at Duck Lake. The public mind over the Dominion felt that prompt action was necessary in order to preserve the peace of the Dominion The call for volunteers went

forth, and we know how readily that was responded to. (Applause.) From all parts of the Dominion offers of troops poured in, and the gentleman at the head of the Militia Department, who was charged more particularly with the selection of the troops, had a difficulty in discriminating amongst those who wished to be sent forward. (Hear, hear.) It speaks well for this country that we have such a citizen soldiery—a body of men who, although unused to military life further than reviews on grand occasions, and meetings for their own amusement and the gratification of their countrymen, have been found, when the occasion called for it, to be not merely holiday soldiers, but that in active service they had all the grit and ability of regular, disciplined troops, able to endure hardships of no ordinary character and, moreover, that they had, what is often lacking in mere professional soldiers, an ardent devotion to their country and a determination to distinguish themselves in arms. (Hear, hear.) The hon. gentleman who introduced these resolutions to our notice has gone so fully into the subject that I do not intend to follow him. I may however draw attention to one or two points that struck me as worthy of note. The first and most important incident that had a bearing on the whole question was the fact that when the engagement took place at Fish Creek we found Major-General Middleton was not willing to send his volunteer troops to a point of danger that he would not himself dare brave. At Fish Creek he led his men and was found, one part of the day, at so forward a point that he proved a mark for skilled riflemen who were concealed in the pits. I need only call the attention of the House to the fact that his two aides were disabled and he, himself, received a shot through his cap. One of his aides had his horse shot under him first, and then, not willing to retire, and getting another horse, he was disabled by a bullet which drove him from the field and the other aide, Lieut. Doucet, was also compelled to go to the rear in consequence of a wound. The effect of the Major-General showing himself in the front and being willing to expose himself in the manner he did so pluckily, had, I think, a sympathetic influence on the troops under his command. It at once established a tie between the men and their general, and that was evidenced throughout the whole compaign. He found them willing soldiers, determined to go where he commanded them. There was no looking back—the difficulty was to keep them from rushing to the front and madly exposing themselves. It became necessary to adopt the style of warfare pursued on the other side. It was very much a battle of duellists—men selected on each side for their skill as marksmen, and the effort was to hit your man and keep yourself under cover. Unlike the battles of the past it was a combat largely of skilled marksmen, and therefore we know that the smallest exposure led to men being struck, and Major-General Middleton had difficulty preventing his men being killed. I think it is a subject matter worthy of notice here that knowing the class of men he had under his command he was sparing of them. (Cheers.) He did not desire to sacrifice them. He did not send them to the front in large bodies, by which means, possibly, the battle might soon have been ended, but which would have resulted in the loss of life being very much larger. The whole campaign has been most skilfully managed. I am glad the Minister of Justice mentioned Colonel Otter's march through the Cree reserve, because at the time the propriety of it was somewhat criticised. Very many thought he went without orders—that it was unwise for him to do so with the comparatively small force, and knowing that Poundmaker had a very large band of warriors, I think four times at least the number of Colonel Otter's force. The march from Battleford was certainly worthy of notice, particularly as the men marched through the greater part of the night and commenced the fight before the dawn of day, before they had received any refreshment. They went into the fight without waiting to rest, and were only compelled to withdraw because their two guns gave out, the woodwork of the carriages being in bad order. The commander very properly, I think, retired. At the moment, it was thought he had accomplished nothing, but those who passed that judgment were rather premature, because the shock that Poundmaker got in that engagement stopped his joining Big Bear and Riel at points further

east. (Cheers.) Therefore it accomplished all that could be expected. I need not refer to the subsequent fights at Batoche which completed the quelling of the insurrection. It was all promptly done, and without any greater loss of life than I suppose is necessarily incidental to a campaign of that kind. It is worthy of note in my judgment that the General sought to save, as far as possible, the lives of his men. (Hear, hear.) Not like some other generals of modern times, who boasted that they only thought of the end to be accomplished, and the time within which the victory was to be achieved, and then the holocaust was to be offered up to attain those two ends. The victory was obtained in the North-West by the exercise of prudence and judgment backed by firmness and decision. Of course the hardships were very great. Those young men, many of them from offices, were purely holiday soldiers, not accustomed to fatigue of that kind, and it is marvellous to think what they endured. I do not desire to criticize the commissariat, because, as my hon. friend has said, it was a new experience for any of our departments, and, I am bound to say, it was admirably provisioned ; at the same time, in the novelty of the situation, some mishaps must have occurred, and those men were obliged to live upon food to which they had not been accustomed. Hard tack and salt pork, probably, are, in the judgment of some, the best food with which to go through a campaign, but many of those men found it difficult to keep up their strength on such rations. Then, it must be remembered it was a season of the year which is, probably, the most inclement in this climate, March and April, with snow and slush on the ground, the men sometimes overheated by day and suffering from intense cold at night. All this was endured without a murmur. It is true that a good deal has been written about it in the press, but so far as the volunteers were concerned, and so far as we can hear, they were quite content to endure the sacrifices without murmuring or flinching. In a short, sharp struggle like that, no doubt, we have to lament some fallen brave. It was incidental to a campaign that some lives had to be sacrificed at the shrine of their country, and we can but express our deep regret that those lives have been lost under the circumstances. The names of those who have fallen will be written in the history of this country, and I have no doubt their memories will be warmly cherished, not only by their comrades-in-arms who fought with them, but by the whole Canadian people. (Cheers.) To the relatives, the families who have lost those near and dear to them, we can but offer up our tribute of sympathy. Those families will feel that the brave heroism that has resulted in the loss of valuable life, is duly appreciated by a grateful country, and it is therefore some slight consolation to them to know that we all deeply sympathise with them in their loss, and to feel that the whole people of Canada are grateful for the sacrifice they have made. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. friend. (Cheers.)

Hon. Mr. ALLAN—It would seem almost superflous to take up the time of the House by saying anything more in support of a resolution which, I am sure, commends itself to the most hearty support of every one of us ; a resolution, moreover, which has been spoken to so ably and eloquently by the leader of the House and the leader of the Opposition. At the same time I feel that I can hardly sit silent when a vote of this kind is being taken, without venturing even for a few brief moments to express the feelings of pride and satisfaction with which one's heart is full at the gallant conduct of our volunteers, and the satisfaction one feels at the proof which has thus been given us that notwithstanding all our party strife and bickering Canadian patriotism is something more than a name; that Canadians are willing to give up ease and comfort and private interests, aye, and sacrifice life itself, when the safety and honor of our common country are concerned. In this spirit I see an element of national strength at which we may well rejoice. When we see our volunteer militia from all parts of the Dominion—men from Ontario, men from the Maritime Provinces and men from Quebec standing shoulder to shoulder to put down insurrection and restore order, I think we may well feel that in the service of our common country Canadians know no distinction of party or race, (applause,) that we are all

Canadians, loyal subjects of one Sovereign yet attached to our native soil and glorying in the young, vigorous, national life which has been so freely accorded to us, while we are still attached and loyal members of that great and mighty empire to which it is our pride to belong. (Applause.) I shall not attempt to detain the House by dwelling upon the pluck and endurance displayed by our volunteers, their cheerful and patient endurance of hardships and privations, and their gallant conduct under fire, which has called forth such high encomiums from the Major-General commanding them, and I shall only briefly say how heartily I concur with what has fallen from the leader of the Government, and in what has fallen from the leader of the Opposition in reference to the brave and gallant Major-General, himself, and especially to the considerate and judicious and, if I may use the expression, "the fatherly way" in which he commanded our citizen troops throughout the whole campaign. I would desire however for a moment to call the attention of the House to the fact that the men of whom we are so justly proud were drawn from all classes of the community as well as from all parts of the Dominion. They come from the town and from the country, from the counting house and the farm, from the bank and from the workshops, and the universities, and the legislature, law and medicine, aye, and the Church, too, were all represented—all were equally ready and anxious to obey the summons when it came, and all have equally borne themselves throughout the whole campaign as brave and loyal soldiers. I desire not to speak in any vainglorious or boastful spirit as if our brief North-West campaign were a great war, but I think I may surely go this far and say that in the spirit which has been evoked and which has been displayed by men of all ranks, and from all parts of the Dominion, we have a cheering proof that Canadians, without distinction, believe that they have a country which is well worth making sacrifices for, and I will only add I feel assured that in this same spirit of brave and manly patriotism, the noble heritage which God has given us on this North American Continent will be guarded and preserved alike by those who come from "the little isles beyond the sea," and those who are descended from them, and by our brave and loyal fellow subjects who trace back their lineage to that great country which first brought Christianity and civilization to our shores. (Applause.) All honor, then, gentlemen to our volunteers, and I only hope that when the vote is taken it will be taken all standing, and it will show that it is not merely lip service we render them, but we offer them the homage of our hearts. (Cheers.)

HON. MR. TRUDEL—Before the vote is taken I wish to add a few words. I think amongst the merits of the general campaign in the North-West there is one which should be pointed out, and which has not been referred to. It is no secret that amongst those unfortunate rebels there were many for whom the people of one of our provinces had great sympathy. There are two questions in this matter. There is the question of the causes of the rebellion and there is the rebellion itself. I think there are not two opinions on that point. We were all united in the feeling that this rebellion should be stamped out immediately, and we all agree in complimenting the gallant officers who commanded the Canadian troops; but at the same time, for those who had sympathy with a portion of the population out there I may say it was to them most gratifying to find General Middleton displaying such a moderate and charitable feeling towards those deluded people. It is a fact that, as far as we can judge, our Major-General found means to reconcile in a high degree his sense of duty as a commanding officer with a spirit of moderation and charity very seldom found under such circumstances. Therefore I thought it was my duty, in the name of the province which we specially represent here, to compliment him on this aspect of the affair.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I will not occupy the time of the House with any extended remarks. I merely rise to say a word for those volunteers who were not sent to the front. I know that the militia of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and particularly those of my own county, the battalion which I have the honor to command, were ready at the call of duty to go

to the front, and chafed because they were not allowed to do so. They showed as loyal a zeal to serve their country as those who were fortunate enough to have the opportunity of showing it, and I could not help rising to say a few words in favor of those who were chafing at not being called out to assist in putting down the rebellion. (Applause.)

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—Having before my mind the fact that I was myself, until a few months ago, a civil servant, I wish to add to the expressions of gratitude which have fallen from those who have spoken upon those resolutions to General Middleton and the troops in the field, some recognition of the services rendered by the officials in the Militia Department. They have not risked their lives or spilled their blood in the defence of their country, but they have devoted themselves in a manner beyond all praise to the duties of their office. They gave all their leisure hours, working day and night voluntarily and cheerfully to aid the Minister of Militia in accomplishing the great work which he has brought to a conclusion in a manner so creditable to himself and to his country. I wish their names could be added as servants deserving equally with those who fought in the field, the thanks of their country.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—It was hardly an omission because it was my intention, but for the fact that it is now six o'clock and the House seems desirous to have the discussion ended before recess, to have referred to the services rendered by the Militia Department I felt, while the leaders on both sides were speaking in terms so well merited of the volunteers and their General, that I could have added something to the subject. I join in the tribute which has been paid to the Minister of Militia. (Hear, hear.) If the General in command has proved to be the best man for the position, he was selected by the Minister of Militia, and the selection must have met with the approval of the Government. It was a great advantage to have at the head of our forces such an efficient commander as General Middleton, a man for whom the country will always entertain a sentiment of gratitude; nevertheless, I believe the Minister of Militia is entitled to great praise for the manner in which he managed his Department under such trying circumstances,

Hon. Mr. POWER—I wish to say that I quite concur in the remark of the hon. member from DeLanaudiere as to the Minister of Militia. I was prevented from speaking by the fact that the leaders of both parties had spoken on the resolution, and I thought that was sufficient at this stage of the session; and I felt it was the less necessary for me to add anything, because I had at an earlier stage of the session expressed my own humble sentiments with regard to the efficiency of the Minister of Militia and his officers.

The motion was agreed to, all the members rising in their places and voting unanimously.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

AFTER RECESS.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES BILL.

COMMONS AMENDMENTS AGREED TO.

A message was received from the House of Commons to return Bill (V), "An Act respecting the administration of justice and other matters in the North-West Territories," with the following amendments:

Page 1, line 17.—After "member" insert "or he may, with the advice of his Council or Assembly, as the case may be, from time to time rearrange such electoral districts, or any of them, so as to secure as far as possible in the Council or Assembly of the North-West Territories the representation of each district, not exceeding one thousand square miles and containing one thousand inhabitants of adult age; and insert the following as Clause A:—

"The seventy-fourth section of the said Act is hereby amended by substituting the word 'four' for the word 'three' in the fourth line thereof."

Page 3, line 10.—After "law" insert the following as Clause B:—

"The Minister of the Interior may, subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Council, make such arrangements with the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba as seem reasonable as

to the compensation to be made by Canada to that Province for the care and maintenance of persons detained in the said asylum or in such temporary asylum as aforesaid."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The last of these amendments is to enable the Governor in Council and the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba to make such arrangments as they may consider advisable or necessary for keeping patients from the North West Territories in the Manitoba asylum. The second amendment is to increase the number of stipendiary magistrates from three to four. The other amendment is with reference to a provision which the bill originally contained for the re-adjustment of constituencies. Under the existing law their boundaries are fixed and cannot be changed. The bill, as it originally stood, provided for changing the boundaries of constituencies, and this amendment is to give further power to provide that no electoral district shall exceed 1,000 square miles in extent, and that a district containing a certain population shall be entitled to representation. I move that the House concur in the amendment.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—It strikes me that this is a rather late period of the session, and rather a hurried manner, for carrying such an important measure, one settling the limits of the electoral districts and it rather too much, in my mind, resembles a certain measure with which we were familiar a session or two ago in Canada. It seems to me that a bill going down from the Senate and sent back to us containing this amendment, dealing with a very important matter in connection with the future of these Territories, should not be dealt with in this hasty and irregular way. A measure of that kind should be brought down betimes in the session, and an opportunity given for both branches of Parliament to consider maturely such an important matter. Of course we have no alternative but to let the bill pass, but I shall certainly not vote for it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think my hon. friend is unjust. The Bill was brought down long ago. It was before us three weeks ago.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I am speaking of the amendment.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Well, we sent it down as soon as we could to the other Chamber, and they amended it and returned it as soon as they could. The amendment, to my mind, is not of a very serious character. We permit them to change the bounds, provided the population and area shall be so and so. I think there is nothing dangerous in that; I think it is a very just provision. Then, as to the other provision about increasing the number of Stipendiary magistrates, there is nothing dangerous about that, or the other provision about the inmates of lunatic asylums. I think there is nothing in the amendments to which objection should be taken.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (157), "An Act to amend the several Acts relating to Duties of Customs and Excise." (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

Bill (161), "An Act to amend the Act, 46 Vic., Chap. 9, intituled, "An Act to provide for the salaries, and superannuation, and travelling allowances of certain Judges of certain Provincial Courts. (Sir Alex. Campbell.)

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

TENTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ADOPTED.

HON. MR. READ moved the adoption of the tenth report of the Joint Committee on the printing of Parliament. He said: This report recommends that the Clerk, during the recess, advertise for the printing of Parliament. It also recommends that Mr. Wiltshire, who is on the sessional staff, be promoted to the permanent staff. It was found necessary, last year during the recess, to employ labor to the amount of $120. His sessional pay is $250, and it is proposed that it be increased to $500, so that it will be a very small increase, and the clerk says the service of someone is necessary. It also recommends

alterations in the form of printing indexes, distributed here to-day, by which means we will be able to find all the necessary papers that are printed. You will get these a very few days after the session, and instead of being, as heretofore, in the sessional papers in a less convenient form they will be in a list by themselves, so that you will be able to tell just where to find the different subjects; and there is to be a full description of subjects. I may say that the House of Commons have adopted this 10th report.

HON. MR. POIRIER—Before this motion is carried, I should like to say a few words with reference to the efficiency of one of the employees connected with this report—I mean Mr. Romaine of the House of Commons the manager of the printing of both Houses. This gentleman has performed a very valuable work by arranging in alphabetical order our indexes and for this and other deserts he has been paid in the other House a well merited tribute. As he is a good old friend of mine, and as I know his efficiency well, I desire to call the attention of the House to his services. With your permission I will read this short extract from the Montreal *Gazette*:—

This afternoon the report of the Printing Committee was adopted on the motion of Mr. Thomas White, chairman. Mr. Trow said: "They, on thepart of the committee, desired to acknowledge the services of Mr. Romaine, who has prepared the alphabetical index of the sessional papers. Members will find the index a great convenience in arranging their papers in order. In any business we have had with Mr. Romaine, I have always found him to be one of the most practical men in the service of the Government. He has, by his energy and ability, been the means of saving thousands of dollars to the country through the standards and various contrivances for saving time and labor, which he has introduced into his department." The chairman of the committee endorsed the remarks of Mr Trow. He said: "I amsure every honorable member of this House will admit that if there is one officer in the public service who has saved three or four or half a dozen times his salary, that gentleman is the head of the stationery department in this House."

The motion was agreed to.

THE PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY.

FIRST REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ADOPTED

HON. MR. PLUMB moved the adoption of the first report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library of Parliament. He said: The subject of this report is a recommendation to Parliament to place upon the estimates again $2,000 for the publication of the work of the late Librarian, Mr. Todd. I have delayed moving the adoption of the report awaiting the action of the House of Commons. I observe now that the House of Commons have put in the estimates the sum of $2,000, which is recommended by the Committee, and I would therefore ask that the report be now concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (158), "An Act to authorize the grant of certain subsidies in land for the construction of railways therein mentioned." He said: This is a Bill for the purpose of granting aid to certain railways for that purpose, in the first place, of extending the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec and, in the next place, for making a short line between Montreal and the Ports of Halifax and St. John New Brunswick. The grants that it is proposed to give are mentioned in the Bill, and as it is the exclusive right of the House of Commons to grant them, I suppose no hon. gentleman will desire to take the responsibility of resisting the Bill as a whole, and therefore I need not enlarge on the advantages of each particular grant. I am quite ready to discuss the merits of each particular grant if hon. gentlemen desire to enter upon the subject: but in the meantime I content myself with moving the second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—I have had occasion to speak more than once on this subject. It is one in which the people of Halifax particularly, and of the maritime provinces generally, are very much interested. I do not propose to say at the present time anything about the merits of the line which I had the honor to advocate on a former oc-

casion ; but I wish to say a few words as to the desirability of passing this Bill in its present form. As to some portions of the Bill I have nothing to say. One part of it deals with a road between Montreal and Quebec, north of the St. Lawrence. About that I have nothing to say. The only portion to which I wish to refer relates to the so-called "short line," and the point I wish to make is that the Government, in inserting in this Bill a provision for a certain line, have acted prematurely in fixing the route. I do not propose to argue that question at any length, lest it might be supposed that I was speaking without good authority on that point. I wish to quote an authority that I look upon as being as good as any in the Dominion of Canada. I quote from the speech of the hon. member from Grenville in the other Chamber. That gentleman, I think, is recognized as being at the head of his profession in this country ; he is also recognized as being an independent, honorable man, and further, he is a very decided supporter of the Government, having been elected only the other day as their candidate. I shall quote from the official report of the Debates in the House of Commons. There I find that Mr. Shanly is reported to have said amongst other things :—

"I am entirely unable to form any opinion respecting what may be called the engineering merits of the two lines."

HON. MR. PLUMB—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. POWER—That is the line selected by the Government, and another line favored by a number of gentlemen more especially from the Province of Quebec, called the Combination Line. Mr. Shanly continues :—

"I am on general principles in favor of a thorough and complete examination, for I know that vast sums of money have been wasted in various public works of this country and elsewhere by not making complete examination."

Then he goes on to say that he had read the previous debate on the matter, and he concluded his remarks in this way :—

"As regards the plans and surveys and everything else, I say there is nothing before us which would enable any engineer decidedly to state that one line is a better line than the other ; and therefore it is that I rise not to discuss the merits of the line ; but I feel I would be neglecting my duty, I would be false to my friendship, if I were to fail to rise and justify my friend who had not an opportunity of defending himself. And sir, because I think there is not sufficient information before us to enable us to judge as to the comparative merits of these lines I shall act upon that opinion and support the amendment."

The amendment was asking for further surveys. He adds :

"I have nothing further to say than this, that the proper course is to make a complete and thorough survey of the line before any subsidy is voted."

Now I think, appealing to the members of this House, I should be quite safe in resting my case simply on that declaration of a man who is probably the highest authority in his profession in this country. Fortified by that declaration of opinion I have no hesitation in saying that the Government are not justified in selecting the route which they have chosen, the route by Moosehead Lake and Mattawamkeag. I do not propose to enter upon any debateable ground as to distance. I simply take the authority of the report made by the chief engineer of railways and the figures given by his subordinates. Now, hon. gentlemen, I may first explain what the Combination line is. The Combination line is a line which would run from Salisbury, in New Brunswick, a station on the Intercolonial Railway some thirteen miles from Moncton, to Fredericton, and from Fredericton *via* Canterbury to the north end of Chesuncook Lake. When you get as far west as Chesuncook Lake, instead of going directly to Richmond, or instead of simply going to Quebec, or to the eastern end of the International Railway, there are two branches to this line. One runs up by the Etchemin to Chaudiere Junction near Quebec, and the other line runs north of Moose Head Lake to the east end of the International Railway. A great deal was said in the other Chamber as to the comparative merits of the northern branch of this line—that is the line running up to Chaudiere Junction from Chesuncook—and the southern line generally known as the Pope line. I shall not enter into that controversy, because hon. gentlemen here are probably quite as familiar with its merits as I

am. They are set out in Mr. Light's report and in other places as well; but I wish to call attention, more particularly to the line from the east end of the International Railway, to the north end of Chesuncook Lake. There is no need of going to any point west of the eastern end of the International, because that is a common point. Mr. Duffy's survey started from that point, and went north of Moose Head Lake, and Mr. Spofford's survey started from that point and went across Moose Head Lake. In the report of the Chief Engineer of Railways, the lines running across Moose Head Lake are Nos. 5 and 6, and the lines running north of Moose Head Lake are numbered as 8 and 9. Hon. gentlemen will find, on referring to pages 8 and 9 of Mr. Schreiber's report, that the length of the line from the eastern end of the International Railway to St. John, New Brunswick, by the line running across Moose Head Lake, is 472 miles. Hon. gentlemen will find that the distance by the other line running north of Moose Head Lake and north of Chesuncook Lake—the line surveyed by Mr. Duffy and Mr. Vernon Smith—is exactly the same. I wish to call attention to the fact that Mr. Schreiber admits that to be the case. It appears from the tables in his report, and he admits it in his remarks on those tables. Then Mr. Schreiber makes it appear that while the lines are of the same length to St. John, the Mattawamkeag is one mile shorter to Halifax. I am not going to detain the House by an analysis of the figures, but I shall point out in a few words that this is simply impossible. The two lines—the line to Halifax and the line to St. John—are common as far as the station called Harvey, some twenty-four miles from Fredericton, on the existing railway running into St. John. Mr. Schreiber's report points out that as far as Harvey the two lines—the one running north of Moose Head Lake and that running across the Lake—are of the same length. It was suggested by Mr. Vernon Smith, the engineer who made a survey of the eastern end of the northern line, that a point some five miles west of Harvey should be selected as the point of divergence between the line running to St. John and the line running to Halifax. The reason Mr. Smith selected that point is that by diverging there, you would reach Fredericton in a shorter time than by going on to Harvey and thence to Fredericton; and any hon. gentleman who looks at the map will see that when you run down to Harvey and up to Fredericton you take two sides of a triangle, whereas if you take the point of divergence five miles west of Harvey and go direct thence to Fredericton you have but one side of a triangle, which must be shorter than the other two, and Mr. Schreiber's statement that this northern line is longer to Halifax than the other is totally incorrect. The lines are the same length to Harvey, and from Harvey to Halifax as well as from Harvey to St. John, while by Mr. Smith's direct line the distance is less. If the question was between this line running north of Moose Head and Chesuncook Lake, and the line running across Moose Head Lake, I think the reports of the engineers would be enough to decide the case, because the engineers who made the survey of the line north found a very easy line throughout, with easy grades, and with a very moderate degree of curvature; a line very easy to build, and with very few heavy bridges on it—almost none at all—and one can see that from the fact that Mr. Duffy who made a careful estimate of the cost of his line from the International to Lake Chesuncook, estimated it a little over $15,000 a mile. Mr. Smith estimated the cost of his road, the the eastern portion of the line, at something over $16,000 a mile; and anyone who reads Mr. Spofford's report or Mr. Burpee's report, will find it impossible to tell what the cost of the road from Moose Head Lake to Mattawamkeag would be. A careful perusal of the reports of the surveys they made will establish the fact that the line is a very difficult one; that the grades are serious—a grade of 66 feet prevailing for some considerable distance, and that it will be quite impossible to get the grade there down to the commercial standard of 53 feet. There is this feature in connection with the matter, that by taking the road north of Moose Head and Chesuncook lakes the business going over that road could not be tapped by any American road or port. The line does not come in close proximity to any American road or harbor. That is a matter of very great consequence; and, further, the road would

not be under the control, in any way, of an American corporation. There is this further feature to be considered, that while Mr. Schreiber's report shows the northern line to be no longer in mileage than the other, that the northern road is so much more favorable in the matter of grades and curves, and that it would be for practical purposes several miles shorter than the other road. I think these facts were sufficient, or ought to have been sufficient to induce the Government if not to select that route, to at least make further surveys and I have no doubt that further surveys would have been ordered, and a northern route would have been selected, had it not been from the fact that certain gentlemen high in Government favor were interested in the southern route. The combination line would do everything in accommodating the eastern townships that would be done by the southern line—at least it would give those townships all the communication with the Lower Provinces that they could desire. I may be allowed to say a few words with respect to the northern branch of the combination line. In the mere matter of length, the line running up to Quebec, and then to Montreal, is, practically, no longer than the line selected by the Government; but look at the advantages that the country would gain by having that northern connection. You would have at Point Levis connection by a ferry across the St. Lawrence with the North Shore Railway. You would have connection at Point Levis, or at Chaudiere Junction, with the Grand Trunk Railway from Montreal, so that the terminus of that road would be a competing point. You would have the business coming over those two lines from the west to that point; then you would have all the business of the southern branch of the combination. You would have all the business that might be expected to go over the line selected by the Government; and you would have on this northern line the business that would come over the North Shore and the Grand Trunk Railway; and this combination would give to the province of Quebec advantages from this short line which the line selected by the Government does not give at all. Looking at it from a Maritime Province point of view, it would give the lower provinces an admirable connection, the shortest practicable, with the city of Quebec and its vicinity; and if, at any future date, a road should be built more direct than now exists, between Ottawa or any point west of Ottawa and the city of Quebec, it would give the lower provinces a chance to get in that way a good share of the western business. These reasons should have been enough in themselves to have induced the Government to pause before selecting the line that they did select. I do not propose here to go into any further discussion as to the heights of the summits of the roads. I think it only right to say here, with regard to the summit of the Etchemin branch—between Etchemin and Chesuncook—that a good deal has been said with respect to the uncertainty that exists as to the correctness of the statements made by Mr. Light with respect to the height of the pass across the mountains. Mr. Light stated it at 1,200 feet, while the pass on the southern route is 1,800 feet, after which there is a second elevation east of Moosehead Lake of about 1500 feet. It is said that the elevation of the pass on the Etchemin line was ascertained only barometrically; Mr. Light himself ascertained it by the barometer, and Mr. Wickstead ascertained it independently by the barometer; and Mr. Light, who had made a careful survey for the Government last summer of a line east of the Etchemin line, levelled up from the instrumental survey to this pass, and he made it 1200 feet in that way; so that there is no doubt as to the correctness of the statement made by Mr. Light. It may be said, on the other hand that Mr. Shanly and Mr. Light are mistaken, and that I am mistaken also; and it may be asked does anybody else take the same view as we do? There are many members of parliament in the other House, more especially gentlemen interested in the District of Quebec, who take the same view on this subject that Mr. Shanly did. Several members from the Lower Provinces take the same view. The Chamber of Commerce at Halifax unanimously took the same view, and the meeting of the City Council and of the Chamber of Commerce of that city almost unanimously did the same. The city engineer of Halifax—a man standing high in his profession, and who has no axe to grind and

no object but to speak the truth—has spoken against the line selected by the Government and in favor of the combination line; and I may say that the city engineer mentioned in his final report to the mayor that he is a supporter of the present administration.

HON. MR. PLUMB—What view did Mr. Stairs take?

HON. MR. POWER—Any hon. gentleman who has read Mr. Stairs' reasons for the view he took will be satisfied that his opinion is not of very much value on the subject. Reasons more flimsy could not be given. I presume that the reason Mr. Stairs took that view is that the Government took it—the same reason that Mr. Daly had. I wish to say a word about these Lower Province members. I was a little surprised at the stand taken by certain members from the Lower Provinces in connection with this matter. There were certain gentlemen, for instance, the member for Westmoreland, N. B. I knew him to be a good business man. I knew that his county was interested in having the best line built from Montreal to Moncton, because Moncton is in his county. I was a little surprised, however, to find that he was supporting the Government scheme; but when I expressed my surprise I was told there were certain reasons which would appear later on why that gentleman supported the Government scheme. The papers which have since been laid on our table show why the hon. gentleman supported the Government scheme. I find that there is a sum of about $118,000 in the last supplementary estimate, voted to a railway company which that hon. gentleman is, I think, the president and principal shareholder; and I may say that the railway had already received a subsidy of $3,200 a mile from the Government, and I understand it has received a subsidy of about $3,000 a mile from the local government; and I am informed by a gentleman who is in a position to know that the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland with this subsidy can build his road for nothing and own it; and one can readily understand why a gentleman looking forward to receiving for his own road $118,000 would not quarrel with the Government who had the power to give or withhold that subsidy.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I rise to a point of order. I do not think the hon. gentleman has a right to attack a member of the other branch of the legislature and attribute personal motives for voting for a public measure—the furthering of his own interests.

HON. MR. POWER—I am not imputing motives; I simply state what appears from the public papers.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, and the hon. gentleman is adding a motive to it.

HON. MR. POWER—I am simply giving the facts, and hon. gentlemen can draw their own conclusions as to the motive. I may say further that that hon. gentleman no doubt thinks that his county will be more benefitted by having a road built to Cape Tormentine than by having the best road built from Montreal to Moncton. When I saw that item in the supplementary estimates I had no difficulty at all in seeing why that hon. gentleman had supported the Government scheme. Then I was somewhat surprised to find that the representatives of the County of Pictou supported the Government scheme; but when I saw in the supplementary estimate an item of $250,000 as aid for a railway in the County of Pictou, I felt that it was not difficult to understand why they had voted in that way. I give these two cases as instances of the kind of influences that have been at work in favor of the Government route.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—What right has the hon. gentleman to impute motives to members of the other House.

HON. MR. POWER—I do not impute motives; I say there are the facts, and if my hon. friend wishes to say that there are improper motives at work, he is at liberty to do so. I say there are the facts—a grant for $250,000 for a railway in Pictou, and there is the fact of the members for Pictou voting in a way that you would not expect them to vote.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman says he bases his argument as to the consent of those gentlemen to support a Government measure upon the fact that they themselves received subsidies for railways in which they are interested. If the hon. member has a right to attack members of the other House in that way, the principles of debate which govern the two bodies are entirely dissimilar. I appeal to the Speaker to say if that is a proper line of argument.

THE SPEAKER—I must say I am not aware of any rule of this House which prevents an hon. member from attributing motives to any individual outside of the House, whether he be a member of the House of Commons or not. If there is any authority on that point I would be obliged to the hon. gentleman if he would point it out to me.

HON. MR. POWER—I think it was only yesterday that the same question of order was raised in reference to the hon. gentleman himself, on his allusion to members of the other House. Those members, I say, probably thought it was more patriotic to get money for their own counties than to get money for a line from Montreal to Moncton.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—*Honi soit qui mal y pense.*

HON. MR. POWER—I am merely giving you the facts, and hon. gentlemen can draw their own conclusions. Mr. Light's name has been introduced here, and he has been charged with assuming a title that he had no right to, when he claimed to be a member of the Association of Civil Engineers. Several members of this House have had an opportunity of seeing Mr. Light's certificate signed by the President and Secretary of the Association of Engineers. It was dated in 1862, and signed by Mr. Hawkshaw, at that time President of the Association, and sealed with the seal of the Association. It has been said that since that time he had ceased to be a member. That was not the point. The point discussed was Mr. Light's qualification as an engineer; and if Mr. Light was qualified in 1862, there is every reason to believe he is qualified now, as he has been practising engineering ever since; and the attempt to injure Mr. Light's character as a professional man has singularly failed. Another argument used was that so many Maritime Province members voted for this southern route. That, I have dealt with already. Another argument was that if we did not get this road built at once, trade would get set in its present channels, and it could not be got out of them. I think anything more childish than that could hardly be imagined. From the time when railways began to be built in this part of Canada, trade has been running in its present channels, and it will not go out of them until better channels are provided for it. It has been running to Portland for the last forty years, and a year more or less is not likely to settle it more firmly in that channel. Then there is another consideration: The intention is to make a connection between the International Railway and the Bangor and Piscataquis Railway, an American road, before the eastern end of this road is begun. Hon. gentlemen will see that that will give trade an opportunity for becoming set in channels in the State of Maine, before the channels east of that are ready to receive it, and that is more likely to do harm than letting things rest as they are for a year, and getting the best line afterwards. It has been said—it was one of the arguments used, in fact the principal argument used by the gentleman whose name has been mentioned, a member for Halifax, why we should adopt this southern route—that there was danger in delay, and that it was necessary to have something done. There is no necessity for delaying the work. There is one portion of this road, the link from Fredericton to Salisbury, which is common to all the lines; it does not matter whether you go north to Quebec or Riviere du Loup or whether you go south by Moosehead Lake. In these lines, every one of them, the link from Fredericton to Salisbury is an essential link; and I think the proper and business-like and reasonable course for the Government to have taken would have been to have constructed the link from Salisbury to Fredericton during the present year, and made the necessary surveys from Fredericton west o Montreal

between this and the next session. Further, I say that I feel confident that even if we did nothing now; if we passed no measure this session, no time would be lost, because having got so far ahead in the season, it is not at all probable that any company will do much work on any of those lines during the present year; and I have the best reason for knowing that the President of the company that is expected to build this road has stated that he did not propose to do anything on it until next spring. As we are about spending a great deal of money upon a work which, if done in a proper way, may be of great commercial value to the whole country, and the improper doing of which would inflict a permanent injury on a large portion of the Dominion, I think we had better make haste slowly, and take from now until next session to make further surveys to find out which is the best line; and if we cannot wait to do that, then build the link between Fredericton and Salisbury and make the surveys west of that. I regret that I shall not be able to vote for the bill in its present form. I presume it is a bill that cannot be amended in this Chamber.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We cannot amend it.

HON. MR. POWER—Then I, for one, shall feel constrained to vote against it; although I am in favor of several provisions of the bill.

HON. MR. WARK—There has been a great deal of discussion in this House about railways, and I have not hitherto taken part in them; but one point for consideration in connection with all these questions is that the holder of the goods to be shipped has been entirely overlooked. We have heard of the opinions of engineers, and of the opinions of people who live at the various ports which they favor, but when it comes to shipping goods, the man who owns the goods will inquire what it is going to cost him to transport them to a shipping port, and on what conditions he can get his goods shipped from that port to the market to which he wishes to send them. He will send his goods just by the route by which he can have them transported cheapest, and in the shortest time; and neither the opinions of engineers nor of politicians can influence that arrangement. We have had a good deal of discussion about St. John and Halifax as winter ports. I cannot conceive that goods will ever be carried from the North West in the winter season round the north of Lake Superior and thence to the Atlantic, unless there is some remarkable rise in prices in the markets of Europe. Montreal will still be the principal port from which goods will be shipped. There are other goods that will want an outlet from Ontario in winter, and then what must be considered will be the question of the owner's own profit. When the people of Halifax begin to ship grain, and go and purchase it and carry it down in ships that they build for that purpose, they can have Halifax for a winter port; and when the people of St. John become the owners of the property to be shipped, and carry it down to their own ports for shipment, St. John will become a winter port; but so long as the goods are on this western end of the railway line the owners will always select the route by which the cost of transportation will be lowest.

HON. MR. ALMON—I rise with a great deal of diffidence to make a few remarks on this subject because it is so late in the session, and I think the least said, unless it is from a practical point of view, on this question the better. I am not in favor of either of the short lines, whether proposed by the Government or supported by the hon. senior member from Halifax. I think our geographical position is such that Portland must always be the winter port of the Great North-West. The only way in which it can be obviated is if we can have a line going through the British Provinces and centring at Halifax and St. John, by which goods can be carried as cheaply as to Portland or Boston. What I would suggest would be that the Government should either buy the North Shore road and connect it with the Intercolonial, or else buy from the Grand Trunk Railway that portion of their line to Richmond and extend their own line to Montreal, and let it be under the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and let it be known that the freight over that is the same as the freight from Montreal to Portland.

We would then have merchants sending their grain to England by way of Halifax. To be sure the time occupied in forwarding the freight to Portland would be 24 hours shorter, but the price would be the same, and as Halifax is 36 hours nearer to England than Portland is, there would be 12 hours gained. Then I have great objection to going through a foreign country. If there happens to be any little jealousy between the two countries, they could easily, by not allowing goods to pass through in bond, stop our traffic by the short route altogether. We are talking about the benefits of a short line. I think we can lessen the distance as to time between Montreal and Halifax by several hours by making fewer stoppages. We now stop at Amherst to take our breakfast, and we likewise, in two hours, stop at Truro and take another breakfast. Now one breakfast is quite enough for any ordinary man, and as you stay 20 minutes at Truro, you could, by eating only one breakfast, shorten the distance on the Intercolonial Railway at least 12 miles.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—But freight does not take breakfast.

HON. MR. ALMON—I am talking of the passengers. There is a stop of three hours at Richmond, and that stoppage is equivalent to 60 miles. I am of opinion that if the Government instead of aiding this short line would buy the North Shore road and unite it with the Intercolonial railway and charge the same freight from Montreal to Halifax that is now charged from Montreal to Portland, you would then effectually, without exspending any more money, make Halifax the winter port of the Dominion. It may be said that this is not the opinion of the Chamber of Commerce at Halifax. I am glad to be able to say, in the presence of the Senior member from Halifax, that the Chamber of Commerce does not represent the opinion of the commercial community of Halifax. There are parties there who use it more as a vehicle to abuse confederation and the Government than for any practical purpose. I will appeal, not merely to what has takan place in the past but what will take place when this question comes up before the chamber at Halifax. If any gentleman doubts my statement he will only have to take the newspapers of that city and he will find them filled with abuse of confederation and the Government rather than with discussions of practical affairs. It is a political tool used by parties who intend to run the next election, and in addition to abusing the confederation and the Government, to abuse the two members who represent the city and the county in the House of Commons.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—It is questionable whether it is an advantage to speak at all at such a late period of the session, but I cannot allow this Bill to pass without making a few remarks. There are in this Bill two very important features, a provision to buy the North Shore Railway, and one to encourage the construction of a short line. I much regret to say that on both those important subjects my decided opinion is that this proposed legislation should not be adopted. I will not enter into the details of the arguments which might be used against the measure. I will only represent to the House that in my opinion it is a departure from the fixed principle which has been the foundation of the general policy of the Government for many years—that is to favor as much as possible national lines on Canadian territory. As to facilitating the purchase of the North Shore Railway, I may say the Bill does not go so far as to declare that the money shall be used to redeem the North Shore absolutely. Unless it is used for that purpose within a certain space of time it will, no doubt, be devoted to other purposes. Three years ago the North Shore, Railway belonged to the Province of Quebec; it had been built at great expense by the province with a view to making it a portion of our great transcontinental highway, the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the spring of 1882 a great contest took place in our province, the local government deciding to sell the railway, contrary, I do not hesitate to say, to the desire of a majority of the Conservative party in the province. It was sold, against the wish of the party, and against the public interest. It is well known now, and it was known at the time of the sale, that the transaction gave certain private parties a clear profit of $1,250,000. Strange to say, while at that time a majority of the leading men of the Con-

servative party were absolutely opposed to the sale of the railway, three years afterward we are called upon to vote $1,500,000 of the public money to redeem that railroad. In other words we are called upon to vote a sum which is equal to the clear profit that has been realized or is to be realized by private parties on the sale of that land, although it is pretended that the line should not be sold, that it should be retained because it is to the interests of the country to keep it. To-day we are called upon to pay $1,500,000, to redeem it from a company which is supposed to possess the greater part of the shares, and the object of the expenditure is to put us exactly in the same position as we were three years ago. I could not allow this bill to pass without calling the attention of the House to the point. It is true, to a certain extent, this matter was a provincial one, but hon. gentlemen will bear in mind that even after that sale it was considered to be without effect, and probably the railway should be returned to the province of Quebec had it not been for the action of this Parliament. The purchasers and those who sold the road wanted to have the right, in order to realize any money profit on their transactions, to issue debentures, and it was found that they could not do so without legislation from Parliament. On that occasion my hon. friend the Hon. Mr. DeBoucherville opposed the bill, and had his motion carried, the purchasers of the road would very likely have been obliged to return it to the province. It is proposed by this bill that if, within a certain number of weeks or months, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company do not make arrangements to get possession of that railroad, then the $1,500,000, shall be employed in some other way to bring the Canadian Pacific Railway down to Quebec. I express here my hope that the Government will do their best to devote that $1,500,000, towards the construction of another railway which would nearly double the value of property on the north shore of the St. Lawrence in the province of Quebec and give to the city of Quebec what they desire—the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I will not say anything more on this question of the North Shore Railway. Now, as to the proposed short line, it is a matter of immense importance to the province of Quebec, especially to the great centres of that province, and above all to the city of Quebec. I said at the outset that this portion of the measure was, in my opinion, a departure from the well known and well defined policy of the Government, or I might say the Conservative party, that—two positions being equal—we should favor a line which is more advantageous from a national point of view. It is often remarked that trade must find its level in spite of national interests, but this is true only to a certain extent, as daily experience demonstrates. For instance, it is recognized by everyone that our Canadian waterways are the best and shortest routes for the produce of the west, yet, notwithstanding the enormous expenditure which we have made to enlarge and improve our canals, there have been years when I think not more than five per cent. of the produce of the West, which should naturally come by Canadian waters, has passed down the St. Lawrence; ninety-five yer cent. has gone to the seaboard by American canals and railways. We are therefore forced to the conclusion that this is due to the determination of the Americans to favor their own railways and cities at any sacrifice, and it proves that it is quite possible by the action of the government and the country to modify to a certain extent the course of trade. I have taken great pains to examine this matter of the choice of a short line thoroughly. I consider that the Canadian Pacific Railway being built, the only reason which would justify us in giving public money to encourage a short line is that it would be, without any doubt, the best line that could be selected. I regret to say that the line which is mentioned in the Bill is not, in my opinion, the shortest line. I have read carefully the reports of the rival engineers. There is the report of Mr. Schreiber, it is true, in favor of the line mentioned in this Bill, and there are two different reports of Mr. Light, which, to my mind, establish beyond any doubt that the shortest line would be one which is indicated on a map which, I suppose, every hon. member has seen, called the short line railway, between the cities of Montreal and St. John and Halifax, and which is known as the combination line. My hon. friend from Halifax has alluded to it already. Mr.

Schreiber has called in question some points in the report of Mr. Light, but in the subsequent report Mr. Light takes up these points and shows that not only by his own survey, but by reports of other engineers which are not questioned, Mr. Schreiber's criticism of his report is not well founded, and this reply, to my mind, defies contradiction. As to the length of the several lines there is not much difference. I think that the combination line, which unites all the advantages of a through line, which favors the interests of Quebec as well as the interests of Halifax and St. John, is 27 or 28 miles shorter than the one selected, while the grades are much more favorable. Mr. Light shows that in the line which has been selected by the Government there are grades which prevent it being a commercial route, and it cannot be used advantageously for the carrying of heavy freight. I know that the accuracy or value of Mr. Light's report has been questioned, but this House should bear in mind that Mr. Light cannot be accused of favoring any private interest. He has been employed by the Province of Quebec to examine this line in his capacity as engineer for the province, and his report, based upon figures which are proved to be correct by the reports of other engineers, forces us to the conclusion that he is right in his view. Now what is proposed to us by this Bill? It is to vote public money to build a short line which is objected to by competent engineers as not being the shortest line, and, moreover, as being a route which passes so near American cities that it will carry our trade to foreign shipping ports, giving them the profits which we should derive from our enormous expenditures upon the Pacific Railway. While we are pursuing a policy to develop our trade and build up our own cities, we are about to aid a line which will carry our trade to American seaports, and they will gain the principal benefit to be derived from our large expenditures. Under these circumstances I regret to say I am obliged to protest against this Bill. I sincerely believe that the policy to the Government is not in the interests of the country, and I trust that they will reconsider the matter. Of course I do not expect to create any conviction in the minds of the majority of the House, but I understand the Bill is leaving to the Government a certain margin of discretion, and I hope even after the Bill is passed that they will reconsider this matter and ask themselves whether this is not a departure from their policy, and whether this appropriation should not be suspended until at least an instrumental survey shall be made.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I do not wish to detain the House on this Bill, but I should like to make one or two observations. I regret that the Bill, as it stands, is one which I cannot support. It contains some things which I consider are not in the interests of the country, and there is a part of it which is calculated to retard the development of the Dominion and to injure the prospects of the Lower Provinces Some two years ago I voted against a bill which proposed to grant a a company power to build a bridge over the St. Lawrence, west of Montreal. The reason which I gave for my vote on that occasion was that until our great highway would pay, I considered it was our duty, as the Parliament of Cana da, to see that thetrade of the west shoul d not go to the United States but should be carried to Canadian sea ports, and consequently that we ought not to allow the St. Lawrence to be bridged west of Montreal. My opinions are the same to day. I believe that we ought not to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to cross at Montreal and reach Halifax, St. John, or St. Andrews by passing as near to Portland as the proposed road will do. If the line mentioned in this Bill were the shortest possible route, I would say that it was a strong argument in favor of it, and that we must give the commerce of the country the shortest route to the sea-board. But I regret to say that my conviction is that that short line, improperly so-called, is not the shortest practicable route. My conviction is that a road to Montreal, to St John and Halifax, by way of Quebec is the shortest. That is the conclusion to which I have come from reading the reports, and a letter of Mr Sullivan and another letter which I have seen today by a civil engineer of Halifax, and a letter from Mr. Smith and the opinions expressed by others.

If I take the figures of all those engineers, and if I take the figures of Mr. Schreiber, I find the shortest route is not by the south of the St. Lawrence, but is by Quebec. No doubt if I took the very bad argument, that we should follow as nearly as possible an air line, that route would be only 20 miles from the air line, while Quebec would be 80 miles. If I take that argument I should say that the Loop Line is the shorter of the two. But, hon. gentlemen, that is not the way we have to look at it when we are deciding upon a short line. The short line, to my mind, means this; it is a line by which an ordinary engine with 20 cars will reach its destination quicker than by any other. I say that two engines of the same capacity, each having 20 cars equally loaded, one train taking the so-called short line, and the other the combination line, the latter will reach Halifax *via* Quebec quicker than the other would by way of Sherbrooke. That is what I call the short American line, and anything to the contrary is misleading to the public. The line by Quebec is a little longer; but it is admitted by Mr. Schreiber, in his report, that the grades by the present short line are higher than they are by the Quebec line, while the curves are sharper on the short line than they are on the Quebec line. That is the reason why the northern route is practically shorter, though it has greater mileage. Such are the arguments I take from Mr. Schreiber's reports, although he recommends the short line. Still, his report may not have been based on engineering reasons; he may have had other reasons for reporting in the way he did. I remember that when the construction of the North Shore road was commenced we had three or four dozen of surveys, and I had, myself, the good fortune to report against those reports showing that they were misleading to the Government of Quebec. It is because I have had that experience that I state what I am saying to-day. It is because I have examined those reports that I say the Sherbrooke line is the longer line, practically, and that the Quebec line is the shorter line for business purposes, and, in the interests of the country, ought to be adopted. I do not mean to say that that road ought necessarily to be located wholly on Canadian territory. We have the Intercolonial Railway, and if the line by Quebec, passing through Maine to Moncton, were adopted, we would have a combination line which would be the shortest American line, and then, in case of war, the Canadian Pacific Railway, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, would form an all-rail route on Canadian territory from ocean to ocean. I believe that those are questions worthy of consideration, and it must be because the Government consider that the position I take is incontrovertible, that they will not allow a proper survey to be made, because I say that those surveys have not been conducted in such a way as to be relied upon. In reading the reports of the debates in the other House, what have we seen? A gentleman who was elected only a few days ago as representing Conservative principles, a supporter of the Government, who is considered to be one of the ablest engineers in Canada, said that those reports could not be relied upon, and that the report of Mr. Light deserved the consideration of the Government, and that before deciding this question, the Government ought to have another survey made. Such a statement, made by Mr. Shanly, ought to receive due consideration from the Government, and a new survey should be ordered before this line is adopted. We know that when the Bill is passed the money will have to be devoted to the purpose for which it is appropriated, but even then it can be managed in such a way as to give us the best line. Having such an opinion with respect to that part of the Bill, I am bound to protest against it; but the other parts of the measure being satisfactory, I cannot vote against it, though I would be ready to vote for an amendment which would suspend the objectionable part of the Bill until a new survey could be made.

Hon. Mr. DEVER—I do not think there is anything that I can possibly say will have the slightest influence on the Government to induce them to alter this matter. I believe the Government are clear sighted and business-like, and are strong minded enough to do what they conceive to be best to construct a road to the Maritime Provinces that will, this time, be a commercial project. We can look back to the fact that on a former occasion a road was constructed through the

Maratime Provinces, unfortunately, in a way not to be a road such as is required for commercial purposes. Hence our decision to-day is that we must construct another. I cannot cast any reflections upon the representative of New Brunswick in the Cabinet of that day, for I must confess that I, myself, after finding that the road was to go by the north shore, encouraged him to hold his position, notwithstanding the fact that it was forced upon him that the Province of New Brunswick should take the road in that way. When we were coming into Confederation one of the conditions of the Union was that we were to have a road from New Brunswick to Canada. It was understood then that there were three routes, one of which would be selected. One was known as the southern route, the other the central, and the third the northern route. It was stated in New Brunswick, and especially in the commercial city of St. John, that the southern route, the one we are now converging towards by this project, should be the road selected by the Government of Canada to accomodate the commerce of St. John. Our representative in the Cabinet, I think, pretty nearly promised that it should be the route; but the pressure brought to bear by Halifax, the Province of Nova Scotia generally, and, it was said, also by the British Government and the Government of the Province of Quebec, carried the balance in favor of the North Shore road; and the result has been that St. John from that time until now has never been satisfied with the North Shore road. For these reasons we are to-day anxious to have a commercial route, believing that the city of St. John is so geographically situated as to become a great shipping port for Canada and the west during the winter season, provided we had a commercial route to carry trade to that port. One hon. gentleman stated here that his great fear was that in carrying out a project of this kind, the trade would be intercepted by the city of Portland, or the city of Bangor, in the State of Maine. We are not afraid of the city of Portland, because the Grand Trunk Railway at present terminates at that port. As for the city of Bangor, we are not afraid of that either, because it is closed with ice in winter season. It is situated on a river that is frozen over as early as the rivers north of it, hence it would be no object to ship goods to Bangor during the winter, because they could not be shipped from that port; they would have to come to St. John, and the great object is to get a direct route to the port of St. John where it is open the year round. I feel great regret on this occasion, that I have somewhat to advocate a road that is not satisfactory to the city of Halifax. I regret this the more, because since I have had the honor of a seat in this House I have always had the interests of Halifax equally at heart with those of the city of St. John. We have no envy or desire to injure Halifax; we would be most happy that Halifax should have her fair share of the trade of Canada; but we cannot help our geographical position on the sea coast. We are nearer Montreal and the west. We have an open port the year round, and we fear nothing, provided we have a direct commercial route from the west. That commercial route is a road that will have to pass through a portion of the United States; it will have to be a company road; it will have to be operated as a company road, and on commercial principles. Hon. gentlemen will see that Halifax has nothing to complain of. Halifax to-day has the great Intercolonial Railway, so has the Province of Nova Scotia, and so has the northern portion of New Brunswick; and as for the city of Quebec, I do not see how it can be jealous of a direct line. I do not see how they can suppose that we are to submit a second time to have a road specially built—after building the Intercolonial Railway—for the use and benefit of Quebec alone. They must not be too selfish. They must see that, after all, trade, like water, will find its level, and that the shortest route must prevail, and that route, by looking at the map, is not a line touching at Quebec. Starting from Montreal, and taking the city of St. John as an objective point, it will be seen that no line can be projected touching at Quebec that will be much shorter than the Intercolonial Railway. If you want a short route that will not be superseded, a commercial route, you must select the shortest; and while we are about it, let us finish it as speedily as possible, and give the people of St. John something that will satisfy them that they did not come

into Confederation to be deprived of their commercial and geographical rights as a shipping port.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time on a division.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION BILL.

THIRD READING.

Bill (156), "An Act to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into Canada," was reported from Committee, read the third time and passed without debate.

The Senate adjourned at 10 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Saturday, July 18th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at eleven o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE NORTH-WEST REBELLION.

INQUIRY.

HON. MR. TRUDEL inquired—

Whether the Government intends to cause to be made, by officers competent and affording every desirable guarantee of justice and of impartiality as well in respect of their knowledge and character as in respect of their feelings towards the interested parties, strict enquiries and thorough investigations to ascertain:—

1. What are the true causes, whether direct or indirect, of the rebellion in the North-West?

2. What are the best means of repairing the harm done and of preventing for the future any repetition of the same disasters?

3. Whether it is true that acts of barbarous atrocity, such as the fact of massacring wounded after the battle, of burning houses after having chased women and children out of them, of destroying provisions, furniture, clothing, bedding and other property of these unfortunates, so as to leave them without any means of living, and other acts of the same nature, have been committed by any one, acting under subjection to the Government, or acting not under subjection to the Government?

4. Whether it is the intention of the Government, if it ascertains the truth of these facts, to prosecute the perpetrators of these atrocities?

He said—This inquiry speaks for itself. I think it is very important that the causes of the trouble should be investigated, and the facts to which my question relates should be ascertained. I have no doubt that in a future session those facts will give rise to some questions, and I think there is no doubt that it is in the interests of the public and of the Government that these inquiries should be made. I did not observe in the English papers any reference to the subject of my enquiry, but they have been mentioned and commented upon very widely in the French papers, not only in the province of Quebec, but in the United States, and I think it is in the public interest that the allegations should be made the subject of an enquiry. Yesterday we voted with great pleasure thanks to our volunteers, and I am happy to remind the House that there was no dissenting voice. As to the allegations to which I refer I took great care not to state that the deeds referred to were perpetrated by our volunteers, because I hope, if anything of the kind has been done, it has not been done by the soldiery. In case it should happen that anyone was guilty of such crimes, I do not think it could reflect in any way on our volunteer force. It would be an unfortunate circumstance if it were otherwise; and as we say in French, "the exception proves the rule," it would not damage the reputation of our volunteers. If, as I hope, the statements are either untrue or exaggerated, then it is necessary that no doubt should be left on the subject.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No one is more interested in ascertaining the true causes of the rebellion than the Government, since the Government have been accused very roundly of being themselves the cause of it. We have, therefore, the keenest interest in endeavoring to ascertain what the origin of the rebellion was. But I cannot say now what course the Government will pursue in respect to any inquiry that they will make; we have not yet discussed that point. With regard to the question relating to the alleged massacre of the wounded after battle, I do not know whether my hon. friend has seen the telegram which was read in another place in answer to a similar in-

quiry which was made there. The telegram is from Major General Middleton, and is as follows :—

"In answer to yours of the 10th, I have to say that Donald Ross, after shooting Captain French, as was supposed, was shot dead a few minutes after. I saw his body with his daughter sitting beside it, and I have heard since that the priests afterwards buried it. As regards Damase Carriere and Vandal, I never heard their names. I was riding all over the field until late, backwards and forwards, and had any such disgraceful acts been committed I must have seen them. I found one wounded man myself, and sent for a stretcher, which was brought in by some of the men. The man was taken to our own hospital. The whole statement is a foul calumny. I repeat again that the conduct of the men has been wonderfully good. We had five wounded men of the enemy brought into our hospital, all carried in by the soldiers themselves."

So that I am quite convinced that the allegations will prove to be unfounded. My hon. friend will see, as to the principal portion of his inquiry, that it is impossible for the Government now to indicate what course they will pursue.

PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY.

MOTION.

HON. MR. TRUDEL moved—

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General; praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid before this House, a return showing the estimated cost per mile of that part of the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway for which subsides have actually been paid by the Federal Government.

He said—I have already moved for some papers in this matter, and this address will be only to complete the documents which I require.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There is no objection to the address.

The motion was agreed to.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

AN EXPLANATION.

HON. MR. ALMON—Before proceeding to the orders of the day I wish to explain a circumstance which occurred yesterday when the Chinese Immigration Bill was before the House. I had given notice that I would oppose it at the third reading, and that I would move that it be read the third time three months hence. I believe I ought to have given that notice in writing, but having given it verbally, and as it is against a rule of the House that a Bill should pass through committee and be read the third time on the same day, I went home, and did not know the Bill would be read until to day. I am very sorry that I was not here to oppose it, because I think such legislation is a disgrace to humanity. I think it is rolling back civilization from the end to the beginning of the 19th century. The early part of this century did away with the Slave trade, with the Test Act, and gave Catholic emancipation and abolished slavery in the West Indies. We now enact a law which is as vile as any of those to the repeal of which I have just alluded, and I think it will impress an indelible disgrace on this House and on the Dominion. (Order order).

THE SPEAKER—The hon gentlemen cannot reflect on the action of the House in passing the bill.

HON. MR. ALMON—I beg to withdraw the remark, but I am afraid outside of this House that is what will be said of it. The Bill applies not only to British Columbia, but to the whole Dominion. When merchants of Bristol objected to the slave trade being done away with, their wishes were not respected and England abolished slavery, and who says that she did not do right? Those who favored the abolition of slavery were told that the proper place for the negro was in slavery. But the people of Great Britain did not believe it and the world has decided they were right, all other nations having followed in their wake. I feel this Bill to be particularly a disgrace to Nova Scotia. A Chinese could not land there now unless by the payment of $50—he could not land in Nova Scotia whose chief boast is that we abolished slavery within our colony long before even Great Britain did. When cases concerning slaves came before the courts of Nova Scotia the judges refused to charge the jury in favor of the owner of the slave, and the jury refused to give a verdict in favor

of the owner. Catholic emancipation was granted in Nova Scotia and in Cape Breton long before it was taken up in the Mother Country, and Roman Catholics were admitted to the House without taking the oath, and yet, after all that, you say that no Mongolian can enter the harbor of Halifax. I say that this House has done an injury to Nova Scotia, and I am only sorry that I was not here to vote against the Bill even if my vote were the only one recorded in opposition to it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—No doubt if the hon. member had been here and had an opportunity of making his speech it would have relieved his own feelings and he would have felt that he had done his duty, but it would not have altered the result.

HON. MR. ALMON—I do not know about that.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Then the hon. gentleman is quite mistaken in supposing that there was any irregularity in reporting the bill from committee and reading it the third time on the same day. It was reported from the committee without amendment, and it was quite in order to read the bill the third time. The rule of the House is that a bill cannot take two stages in the one day: that is, have two readings, but there is no reason why the House should not receive the report of a committee and, if there is no amendment, read the bill the third time at the same sitting—in fact it is the usual practice.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—Supposing it had been done against the rules, what would have been the result?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—There would have been no result. It would have gone back to the other House. The objection should have been taken at the time.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—I am not referring to this case particularly.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The hon. gentleman asks whether if the real point was a bill being read twice the same day and any objection were taken to it afterwards anything could be done? Nothing could be done. If any person had taken the point of order and it had been referred to the Speaker, then the Speaker would have said "The bill cannot take two readings on the same day", and whoever had charge of the bill might possibly have moved to suspend the rule. Objection might then be taken to that on the ground that you cannot suspend the rule without notice.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—But if it had been passed over?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Nothing could have been done if the House chose to pass over the rule.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—Suppose a Bill passes its second reading and the promoter proposes the third reading, and some member rises and says that the rule ought to be followed, and two readings cannot take place on the same day, and notwithstanding that, the majority say it must be done—is not that contrary to the rule?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes.

THE SPEAKER—The action of the House would be final. This is the highest court in the land and there can be no appeal from it in consequence of any technicality.

HON. MR. POWER—The House can suspend its own rules whenever it likes.

ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN DISPUTED TERRITORY BILL.

FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

A message was received from the House of Commons to acquaint the Senate that they had passed Bill (165), "An Act to continue for a limited time the Act therein mentioned."

The Bill was read the first time.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that rule 41 be suspended so far as relates to this Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

HON SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This Bill is for the purpose of continuing the criminal laws in force in what is called "the disputed territory," between Ontario and Manitoba, for another year. The decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, although substantially determining the boundary, has not yet received the force of law by legislation in Great Britain. Until it has received the force of law it is necessary for the public safety to keep the criminal law in force as it stands now for the remainder of the year. I move that the Bill be read the second time at length at the table.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second and third times and passed.

THE SUPPLY BILL.

FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

A message was received from the House of Commons to acquaint the Senate that they had passed Bill (163), "An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June 1885, and the 30th June 1886, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

The Bill was read the first time.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that rule 41 be suspended so far as it relates to this Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My hon. friend opposite (Mr. DeBoucherville) desired me to explain the whole Bill, and I shook my head because the task is impossible. It strikes me, however, that I may explain it in a very few words. I may say these are the supplies voted by Her Majesty's Commons. I move the second reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—I was going to say that the hon. gentleman might make the same motion for the second reading of the Bill which has just been passed, that it be read at length at the table. The Minister might be kind enough to tell us how many millions the Bill comes to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I do not know.

HON. MR. POWER—That I think is a regrettable confession.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is not my province, you know.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second and third times and passed.

THE CONTINGENT ACCOUNTS OF THE SENATE.

SECOND REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

HON. MR. HOWLAN moved the adoption of the second report of the Select Committee on the Contingent Accounts of the Senate. He said: I may say that the report of the Contingent Committee deals with the expenditures for the past year and also the purchase of stationery for the present year, and allows the Assistant Accountant $100 extra this year for extra work he performed. With the exception of those changes there is nothing different from the previous years.

HON. MR. PLUMB—I wish to say a word or two in regard to the contingent accounts, and that is with reference to the stationery. I have often complained about the supply of stationery which is given to members in the boxes which are distributed in the beginning of the session. This year the ingenuity of the purveyor, or whoever supplied the stationery, seems to have been taxed to the utmost to give us exactly the kind of stationery that nobody cares about using—paper of various colors and patterns which, I think, at our time of life, we can dispense with. It may, perhaps, answer for the amatory members of the House of Commons, or for valentines, or for purposes of that kind; but for honest, sober, business correspondence, I think it is objectionable, and, undoubtedly, it is more expensive than plain white paper. I am content with white paper, and I trust that in making up the supply next year attention will be

paid to the fact that the very heavy paper which is used, and a good deal of that which is used for ordinary distribution, is very much more expensive than the lighter paper which would answer a better purpose. That heavy paper subjects us, when we have to pay postage, to double postage for two sheets, and it increases the expense for paper in a very large proportion as the weight is increased. Some attention to matters of that kind, as well as to the fact that a great many of those things that are put in our boxes are of no use to anybody, might bring about a better state of affairs. I bring my box back after receiving it, and tumble out three-fourths of the stuff that is in it and ask them to give me plain paper in its place. Certainly our stationery supplies are very far inferior, for the convenience of members, to those given to members of the House of Commons.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman from Niagara will be glad to know that the paper of various hues which does not meet his views does not cost as much as that of former years. A further change that he has suggested in the character of the paper has been recommended by the Committee of the present year, and paper of a more useful character willl be distributed in future. I do not, however, rise for the purpose of dealing with what has fallen from the hon. gentleman, but I wish to make a remark on one paragraph in the report, which is as follows :—

> Your Committee recommend that Frederick Merritt, Robert Graburn and Alphonse Duhamel, pages employed by your Honorable House, be notified that their services will not be required at the next Session of Parliament, on account of their having outgrown the position.

I simply wish to emphasize the fact that the Committee do not wish at all that their report should be understood as reflecting in any way on the pages named ; on the contrary, I think that every member of the Committee was perfectly satisfied with the conduct of those boys, and that it is the feeling of the Committee, as it will be of the House, that any recommendation that can be given on behalf of the House that will be of any service to these boys going into other walks of life, the clerk shall be authorized to give, in the shape of a certificate of character to those lads. The Committee felt that those pages had outgrown their position, and that it would be unfair to themselves to keep them any longer in the service of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE BILL.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (157), "An Act to amend the several Acts relating to duties of customs and excise." He said—This is a Bill altering the tariff to some extent. It looks more formidable than it really is. The alterations are not so serious as the Bill of four or five pages, which this measure contains, would indicate. The principal one, I think, is increasing the duty on whiskey, and that will be satisfactory to many hon. gentlemen in this House. There is a corresponding increase on excise. There is also an increase on tobacco. The principal increase is on those two luxuries, if I may be allowed to call them so. With some little experience in this House I have never thought it wise on the part of a Minister charged with the duty I am now performing, to enter into a discussion on the tariff.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second and third time under the suspension of the 41st rule.

SUPERANNUATION AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN JUDGES BILL.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of Bill (161), "An Act to amend the Act forty-sixth Victoria, chapter nine, intituled 'An Act to provide for the salaries and superannuation and travelling allowances of certain Judges of certain Provincial Courts.'"

He said—This is a Bill to give an additional thousand dollars to a judge of the Superior Court of Quebec who may be sitting in Montreal and presiding over the

Court there, as the Chief Justice resides in Quebec, or *vice versa*. Hon. gentlemen who come from Ontario will remember that we had in this Province several Chief Justices presiding over different courts—three or four of them, I think. In Lower Canada at this moment they have two, and by their practice there the business of the court, where the Chief Justice does not reside in the town, is presided over by the Senior Puisne judge, and, in fact, in Montreal where the Chief Justice has not resided in the time of Mr. Meredith, the late Chief Justice or the present Chief Justice, the business is presided over by Mr. Justice Johnston. It entails a large additional amount of labor upon him. He has to discharge the duties of the Chief Justice when the Chief is not present, and therefore I think the increase is fairly due to the gentleman who discharges those duties.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second and third times under suspension of the 41st rule.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES BILL.

THIRD READING.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (158), "An Act to authorize the granting of further subsidies to and making further provision for the construction and efficient operation of the railways therein described."

In the Committee, on the 2nd sub-section of the first clause,

HON. MR. TRUDEL moved that the sub-section be struck out.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The Bill is a money bill and I think we must take or reject it as a whole. That is the ordinary rule, and a rule on which the House of Commons will insist, as on a previous occasion.

The motion was declared lost on a division.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE moved to amend the 1st clause by adding, as a 3rd sub-section:

"The above second sub-section shall be suspended until after a thorough survey of the road mentioned therein shall have been made and submitted to Parliament."

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—It seems to me by this amendment we are to give subsidies for other railways. We have not the right to propose in this House that money shall be granted to railways; such grant must be initiated in the other House.

The amendment was declared lost on a division.

HON. MR. POWER moved, in amendment,—

To strike out the words from "*via*" in the 36th line, to "Salisbury" in the 38th line and insert instead the following: "Salisbury, Fredericton and such points between Fredericton and Montreal as may be determined by Parliament, after surveys sufficient to indicate with certainty the shortest and best practicable route for the said line of railway."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We have not the power to make any amendment to this Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—I think we have, because we very frequently make amendments in bills that relate to the expenditure of public money as long as the amendment does not affect the sum of money expended, or alter the work that has to be done. The Minister of Justice will see that the amendment does not affect the amount of money to be expended or the work that is to be done.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The amendment is out of order. It changes the character of the expenditure and limits it, and says how it is to be done; and these are prerogatives of the House of Commons.

HON. MR. POWER—It is simply protecting a certain section of the country, and I think it is straining the rule a good deal to make it apply to that amendment.

The amendment was declared lost on a division.

On the 3rd clause,

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—I wish to call the attention of the Government to a point that seems to me to be very important. By this 3rd clause the act of last year is changed. Last year an alternative was provided that the Pacific Railway Company might either buy the North Shore road from the Grand Trunk Railway Company or build a new line. By this clause of the bill there is added a provision that the Government may buy the road, and rent it to the Pacific Railway Company. Is that not correct?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Yes, that is correct.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—The hon. gentleman must not forget that when the Syndicate obtained, by some means, the control of the road which belonged to the Government of Quebec, they also got the right to issue debentures to the amount of $25,000 a mile on the road. They then made an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway by which that company guaranteed the interest on those debentures, which amounted to $1,225,000. Those debentures have not reached par, but they have been taken as security, and money has been loaned upon them. Now if the Government buy this road, the holders of those debentures will be in this position: they will have the right to say that the Federal Government is bound to pay them the interest, and those debentures will immediately have a par value. If it is shown, however, that the sale of this road was made under—I do not like to use too strong an expression—but was made under circumstances which may bring about a cancellation of the contract, the Federal Government will be obliged to buy those debentures; I therefore call the attention of the Government to the fact that they may be in great danger, because the Local Government has appointed Judge Routhier of Quebec as commissioner to inquire into all the circumstances connected with the sale of this road. Supposing Judge Routhier should report that fraudulent means have been used in connection with the purchase and sale of the road, this contract may be cancelled, and the Local Government would have the right to any surplus if the road was sold again. I call the attention of the Government to this fact to put them on their guard, that if they should buy the road they may be obliged to pay twice for it, as the Local Government may have a claim on it afterwards.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am obliged to my hon. friend for the information he has given us. Of course it is necessary in a large and important transaction like this to proceed very carefully, and the Government will be more on the alert because of the information the hon. gentleman has given. I believe we are in a safer position since we have the liberty of acquiring those debentures at their present market value.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—But the moral effect will be this: The Federal Government, having bought the road, the debentures will undoubtedly increase in value.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—But if the Government have made arrangments by which they may acquire those debentures at their present value there will be no danger.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—As I am informed the debentures have been pledged as security, and money has been borrowed on them.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I cannot explain myself as frankly as I would like to do; but I will suppose a case. Supposing the debentures are in the hands of a monetary institution which holds a claim against them, and the Government acquire the right to get hold of those debentures by paying the amount for which they are held as security?

HON. MR. TRUDEL—The road was acquired by a syndicate; then it was resold by the syndicate to certain persons who are supposed to represent the Grand Trunk Railway, and they got for it one and a quarter millions of dollars more than they paid for it, or undertook to pay for it, to the province of Quebec. In the case suggested by the hon. gentleman from

Montarville, that by reason of fraud the contract of sale should be set aside, then the position of the Federal Government would be this, they would have paid one and a quarter million for the debentures and by the judgment of the court it would be adjudged the railway should go back to the province of Quebec, so that the Government would lose any right of property in the railway, and would have no means of recovering the money paid for those debentures which would represent the profit of the syndicate who had acquired the railway from the province of Quebec and re-sold it to the Grand Trunk Railway Company at one million and a quarter profit.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Perhaps my hon. friend would give, in general terms, the amount which those debentures are pledged for; it would simplify the matter. Are they pledged to the extent of 50 cents on the dollar?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I would not like to state. The Government will have, or may have, the opportunity of acquiring those debentures at what they are worth in the market, and not at their face value. I cannot go any closer than that. I said with reference to the rest of it that we have to proceed carefully and get a good title, and with the knowledge that there is a commission inquiring into the legality of its present position, we will have to go very carefully. As to the second part of the objection raised, the Government have secured the right to acquire those debentures at their actual value.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—The Grand Trunk Railway Company would not lose anything if the result of the inquiry that is being made by the Quebec Government was to annul the same; because the Grand Trunk Railway has merely promised to guarantee the interest on those debentures. It has not taken the debentures; it has been guaranteed by the law. Then, if that sale was declared null and void, the Grand Trunk Railway would not be obliged to pay the interest. The danger would be for the Government to put itself in this position: that people acting in England would take those debentures.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—We guard against that; there are none of them in England.

The clause was adopted.

HON. MR. READ, from the committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the third reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. POWER moved, in amendment—

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be amended as follows:—

To strike out the words from "*via*," in the 36th line, to "Salisbury," in the 38th line, and insert instead the following: "Salisbury, Fredericton and such points between Fredericton and Montreal as may be determined by Parliament after surveys sufficient to indicate with certainty the shortest and best practicable route for the said line of railway."

He said: The effect of that would be simply to allow the Government an opportunity, if, upon making surveys, they find the route indicated in this Bill is not the best one, to select a better one.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It seems to me that it is voting money for a new object. It is asking that the money be devoted to a different purpose from that contemplated in the Bill. Otherwise, I am in favor of the amendment. I did not speak on the second reading of this Bill, because I thought some of my remarks on a Bill which had come up previous to that were still fresh in the minds of hon. gentlemen. Therefore, I abstained from speaking on the Bill, and even now I shall not dwell upon it to any extent. I am opposed to that line of railway, because when you go southwards 30 miles to Sherbrooke, you actually go south for 30 miles, as far as Nova Scotia is concerned, you have to go nearly 50 miles north again—that is, 80 miles at least added to that line. Then, the line is zigzag. Some one said this line must be shorter than any other because it is the base of a triangle, and any two sides of a triangle are greater than the third side. Although such a proposition is an axiom which is never disputed, it is incorrect in this instance, because the base

is a curve and full of zigzags, and therefore not the base of a triangle as described. I regret that this line has been adopted, especially from the surveys we have had. I cannot, myself, form an opinion as to the shortest line, but when you find such an eminent engineer as Mr. Shanly saying that he cannot decide which is the shortest line on the information before the country, certainly there must be some doubt as to where the best practical line is to be had.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—I submit that this proposed amendment is out of order. It is out of order in two respects: it not only proposes to alter a provision which has come from the House of Commons with reference to the expenditure of money, but it proposes to make a new grant to another road, because it is substantially another road. Even if that were proposed in the House of Commons, it could not have originated except by resolution, and if it would have to go back to the beginning of the proceedings in order to be introduced in that House, much less can it be introduced in this House. The case I am about to cite to the House is much in point, and it seems to me to dispose of this completely, even if it were much nearer to the rule than it really is. The case which I mention is described in May in these words:—

"So strictly is the principle observed in all matters affecting the public revenues, that where certain payments have been directed by a Bill to be made into and out of the Consolidated Fund, the Commons have refused to permit the Lords to insert a clause providing that such payments should be made under the same regulations as were applicable by law to other similar payments."

Showing that the House of Commons assert the exclusive jurisdiction to deal with money and how it shall be expended. They say in this Bill that the money shall be expended between such and such a place, and the amendment says that that shall not be done.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Oh, no.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—It does, because it says the payment shall not be made on the line between such and such a point.

Hon. Mr. POWER—No.

Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL—It provides that if after a survey it should be found the shortest line. There is another objection: it is not proposed to give it to any company; it is proposed to be held in air until a survey is made by an engineer so that in every respect it is out of order, and I ask if the House will sanction it, that His Honor the Speaker decide the point.

The SPEAKER—I have no doubt that the amendment is out of order for the reasons stated by the Minister of Justice, and which I need not repeat. The amendment strikes at the vital principle of the Bill. I shall just read, in addition to the authority cited by the Minister, a paragraph from the latest work we have on Parliamentary practice—Bourinot:—

"The constitutional privileges of the Commons in this particular are now tacitly acknowledged by the Senate never attempting to amend the Supply Bill. If any alteration is now made in a money or taxation Bill in the House of Lords, it is only of a verbal and unimportant character; but even such an alteration is of very unusual occurrence, and so jealous are the Commons of even an appearance of an infringement of their privileges, that they will make a special entry of their reasons for accepting such amendments."

I think the motion is out of order.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL—I shall now move the amendment of which I gave notice—to strike out subsection 2 of section 1. I may observe that the amendment which I propose differs essentially in its character from the one which has been disposed of by his honor the Speaker. It is true that this is a clause which at first sight might be considered one of the clauses of a money bill. It is in fact a clause which is entirely independent of the other sections and it is accidental—this is the point to which I wish to call the attention of the House, and especially of the Speaker—it is only accidental and refers to a matter which might form in itself a separate bill. If I understand the doctrine it is this: the Senate has no right to amend a money bill; it has a right to reject a money bill. Supposing instead of having put three, four, five and six

money grants on the same sheet of paper the Government had presented them separately, then it would be evident that the Senate would have the right to reject any of those bills. Would the Senate lose its right by the accident of coupling them together or by the action of the Government in putting the subjects of those different bills into one—that is, on a single piece of paper which might deprive the Senate of its right? I do not think it. What I propose is to strike out the whole money grant of that railway and then it amounts to the rejection of the whole bill which would be proposed to give a money grant to this company. That is not contrary to the doctrine which has been mentioned by the Speaker. I respectfully suggest that my amendment is in order.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think that this motion is also out of order. The provision is one that is covered by the language of the first clause. The first clause is the language of the grant:—that the Governor-in-Council may grant the subsidies hereinafter granted. To strike out one limb of the grant is as much an alteration of the bill as the amendment which the hon. member from Halifax proposed a moment ago. He proposed, not to strike out the whole limb of the grant, but a portion of a limb and to change the application of the money if the engineer should so report. This amendment proposes, not to take out a part of a limb, but to take out the whole limb and, therefore, to alter to a still larger extent the provision of the bill itself. The proposition is that all the provisions of this grant contained in the first section for the purpose of making a short line railway be stricken out. Of course that is an alteration in the bill and defeats the object of the House of Commons in giving their sanction to this measure and in making the grant—one grant for all the purposes mentioned in the first and second sub-section—and if you strike out that sub-section you strike out one of the material objects the House of Commons had in view in making the grant.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—It seems to me that the reasons given by the hon. gentleman from DeSalaberry are good and logical, but the facts are against him. In the Australian Assembly they tacked to the Subsidy Bill a clause to pay certain employés. The Legislative Council had no option but to reject the whole bill. If my hon. friend's reasoning were sound, the action of the Legislative Council would have been sustained in that instance, but when the case was carried to England it was decided otherwise. It was the subject of a long correspondence, and the result was to show that the Upper House had no power to amend; it could only accept or reject the Bill as a whole.

THE SPEAKER—I must say that the same process of reasoning which the hon. member for DeSalaberry has just now presented to the House has been revolving in my own mind, and that I entertained some doubt as to whether the House might not have the power of striking out an independent section of a bill which, of itself, might have constituted a separate and independent bill, and which would leave the bill, after it was struck out, a perfect bill with regard to the subjects which it controls; and a further reason why my mind was somewhat in doubt on that point was that the Government by a system of tacking on, which has been alluded to, might introduce and pass an obnoxious grant through Parliament in connection with one that had the general support of Parliament. But on mature reflection I have come to the conclusion arrived at by the hon. member from Montarville. I consider this is a money bill which you cannot alter, and if it contains any obnoxious feature the only means by which this House can assert its right to deal with such a feature is by rejecting the Bill as a whole.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—I move in amendment:—

That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending the same by adding at the end of the second sub-section of the first section:—

"The above second sub-section shall be suspended until after a thorough survey of the road mentioned in the second sub-section shall have been made and put before Parliament."

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is open to the same objection.

THE SPEAKER—Yes, I consider it also open to the same objection, and is not in order.

HON. MR. POWER moved in amendment:—

"That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of adding the following sub-clause to the first clause:—

"(3.) The work on the sections of the line between Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury shall be begun and prosecuted simultaneously with the work on the portions of the line west of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine."

The reason I think it desirable to move that sub-clause is that that particular link in the proposed line of railway is the one which is most essential to the lower provinces—I mean to Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and a portion of New Brunswick. Without that link the short line is of no value whatever to that part of the conntry, and there is another reason why it is most desirable that work should be prosecuted on that link at once. This Bill contains a provision for a subsidy for a railway from Riviere DuLoup or Riviere Ouelle to Edmonston—that is the short line from Quebec to the lower provinces. That road is of no value to the provinces of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia unless the link to which reference is made in my amendment forms part of the road. It does not matter what line is chosen for the short line, that particular link from Fredericton to Salisbury will form part of it, and work should be gone on with upon it at once. Now, I do not think that this amendment stands in exactly the same position as those which have been ruled out of order. In the first place, there is nothing in it inconsistent with the Bill; it can stand with the Bill: it does not propose to alter its provisions.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—It stands in the same position as the others.

HON. MR. POWER—I may mention a circumstance in connection with it which shows that at any rate in the estimation of the authorities of the House of Commons it did not stand in the same position as the other amendments. This amendment was moved at the third reading of the Bill in the House of Commons. It was moved originally as an amendment to the resolution, and then afterwards at the third reading of the Bill; and no objection whatever was taken to it on the ground that it was out of order.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The House of Commons was dealing with its own Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—The ground that the leader of the Government took with respect to the other amendment which I moved was that it could not be made in the House of Commons without a resolution, but this one was moved in amend ment to the Bill.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It had previously been moved in amendment of the resolution.

HON. MR. POWER—It does not alter the essence of the Bill before us in any way. It does not affect the amount of money to be spent, and it can stand with the Bill as it is now; and I think it is a case, at any rate, where the rule should be construed liberally. We have been in the habit heretofore of making amendments in bills which provided for the expenditure of money. We have made amendments to Bills relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway and other measures of that sort where money grants were involved.

HON. MR. TRUDEL—I am afraid we are going too far in the sense of abdicating the rights and powers of this House, and especially in the direction, perhaps, in which the whole world is going. It has been remarked very often by what I might call leading men—the superior minds in England—that British institutions were being so rapidly disfigured that England is not far from the time when the British constitution will exist no more. The principle of the constitution is perfect equality of power between the three branches of parliament, and we are every

day diminishing the power of one or two branches and augmenting the power of the third. It will be in a short time quite a new system, and the British constitution will be destroyed. Of course I would not venture to say that, if it had not been repeated perhaps twenty times by Lord Beaconsfield, and even, long ago, by Lord Grey. I make that remark to direct the attention of the House to this point, and I think it is a very remarkable one. I think this Bill is essentially bad, and we are exerting ourselves here to save the Government from an immense responsibility. I hope even after the passing of the measure they will re-consider the matter and see whether those grants should be made.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I hardly think that any further argument is necessary in order to show that this amendment is equally out of order with the others. My hon. friend says it might stand with the Bill as it now stands and is therefore not out of order. In the case I quoted it was only an amendment that the payments should be made under the provisions applicable to other payments. It was to make similar provisions to those which existed relating to the other payments, and with reference to such a point as that the House of Commons objected to.

HON. MR. POWER—This does not affect the payments ; it affects the work.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am pointing out that even a smaller change was objected to. This proposes to change the direction in which the money is to be expended ; that instead of being expended as the engineer or the Governor-in-Council may think convenient, it shall be expended *pari passu* on two roads.

HON. MR. POWER—It does not say the money shall be expended ; it says the work shall be done.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—How can the work be done without expending the money? There is a direct interference on the part of this House with the expenditure of money which the House of Commons says shall be expended otherwise. It is a direct interference which the House of Commons will naturally and properly resist. It seems to me the remarks made by the hon. member from DeSalaberry, if at all just, relate to matters which can only be dealt with by legislation or some change in the practice or usage of Parliament. As it is now, the law of Parliament provides what shall be done, and I do not agree with him in thinking that the practice of the last 50 years has diminished or increased the powers of the House of Lords to deal with those bills. The cases which we are still citing and which govern the action of the House of Lords and the action of the Senate are not cases of yesterday, but have grown up during 100 years and are uniform in tenor, and I do not think the House of Commons asserts for itself now so strongly and exclusively the rights we are speaking of as they did 60 or 70 years ago. This tendency to relax is shown by the fact that they allow the House of Lords to insert penalties and small provisions with reference to such matters as they formerly objected altogether to the Upper House dealing with, and with a little research I think I can show that the tendency of the House of Commons is rather to relax, so far as is consistent with common sense. They were much more jealous of their powers in former years than they are now, but still they have always adhered to the rules which direct the expenditure of money and which are based on a well known principle in the relations of the two Houses. This present amendment proposes to change the disposition which the House of Commons have made of this money and to divert it in a different direction and under different rules, and I think therefore it is out of order.

THE SPEAKER—I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat what I have said with regard to the want of power of this House to alter a money Bill. I consider this would be a vital alteration in the Bill, and I may say if I had any doubt in the matter I should have given the hon. member for Halifax the benefit of the doubt, but I have none.

The main motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

At 12.30 p.m. the Senate adjourned during pleasure.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

The House resumed at 2.30 p.m.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES BILL.

FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (164), "An Act to authorize the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned in aid of the construction of certain railways," was introduced and read the first and second time under suspension of the rule.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—This Bill proposes to grant certain aid to several railways that are mentioned therein.

HON. MR. FLINT—My reason for rising to make the remarks which I am now about to address to the House is that I do not think I have been fairly treated in reference to this matter. When the Napanee and Tamworth Railway Bill came up for amendment to allow the company to extend the road via Bogart to Bridgewater, it was placed in my hands to do all in my power to have it pass through the Senate. I did so, and the Bill was passed. Then I was to do all I could to get a grant towards the building of that railway. As a matter of course I saw the Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, and had a conversation with him, and he assured me that we should have a grant of $3,200 a mile for the road from Tamworth to Bridgewater. That sum was voted two sessions ago, but last year nothing was done with it. The company did not move in the matter, because they thought that they had not means enough to go on with construction, and the consequence was the project was allowed to stand for a while. During that session the promoters came to me and consulted with me about it. The principal men stopped at the same place that I did, and we conferred together with reference to what was to be done. They asked for my assistance and got it. At the conclusion of this year when they came down, instead of coming to see me, they never came near me, and I knew nothing of what was going on until after they had seen the Minister of Railways; and then Mr. Tuttle, from Bridgewater, who was one of the deputation, came to me and told me what was going on. He said that he had had a conversation with the Minister of Railways, who assured me that nothing would be done to the injury of Bridgewater in consequence of the money being granted before; but now I find that the sum of $3,200 a mile is increased to $70,000 and Bridgewater is cut off, the road going to Bogart, some four miles short of where it was intended to go. I do not say anything as far as the Government are concerned; but the parties who induced me to interest myself in the matter have treated me very unfairly. As soon as I saw the bill, not being able to go and see Mr. Pope, the Minister of Railways, I wrote to Mr. Bowell, who was interested, as part of the money is to be expended in his constituency, and afterwards I got a letter from the Minister of Railways in which he seemed not to understand the thing—whether he did or not I cannot say. It showed that they could not grant any more money this year but they granted $6,000 more than they did before, which makes the grant in aid of the road considerably over $4,000 a mile. I also received a letter from Mr. Bowell stating that he had spoken to the Minister of Railways on the subject and that they could not give any further grant this year. This is the position in which the matter stands. I think I have been very unfairly treated by parties who got me to take charge of the Bill, and who got me to induce the Government to make a grant to the road two years ago, and now I find that Bridgewater is left out in the cold. I have made these remarks in order that they may go into the official report so that the parties interested may have an opportunity of seeing them. I dare say the parties require all the money they have got, and more, to construct the road where it has to go.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—The only explanation I have to offer is this,—that the desire of the railway company and their interests lead very strongly in the interest of the public to their making a connection with the Pacific Railway, and by the extension which they are now assisted in making as far as Bogart, they will there make that connection. That

was the great object which the company had in view, and which is an important object in the interest of that part of the country. I am sorry that my hon. friend should have been treated in a way which he thinks is wrong in this matter. I do not know anything about it, and I am unable to offer any remark but to express my regret.

HON. MR. FLINT—It was not intended at the time to connect with the Pacific Railway at all; it was the intention of the company to go to Bridgewater for the purpose of connecting there with the Belleville & North Hastings Road, in order to get out to the back country. That was the object which they had in view, and they were more interested in endeavoring to draw the trade of that back country to their road and to Napanee, and the Pacific Railway was not thought of at that time.

HON. MR. HAYTHORNE—I wish to say a few words with reference to the second road on the list which the hon. Minister has read to the House from this Bill. It is there spoken of as a New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island road, but not one yard of that road is on Prince Edward Island. Notwithstanding that, the people of that province are very much interested in this line, because it is a railway which connects the Cape in New Brunswick, where they land in the winter time, with the Intercolonial Railway. It is therefore their interest that either by some company or by the Government, that road should be completed as soon as possible; and although the sum is small that we are voting per mile for this Bill, still it will be of some service. I only wish that the Government, acting on some suggestions made by members from the island, had thought proper to acquire the Tormentine and Sackville Railway, because if they had done so, it would have made all the roads, including the Prince Edward Island Railway, and from the straits of Northumberland to Montreal, Government lines. Should this road be completed by the company who are now at work upon it, there will be some 45 miles of railway between Prince Edward Island and the Intercolonial Railway belonging to the company, whereas, all the rest of the road we travel on belongs to the Government. It must be easy to see that if any mismanagement, or inadequacy of means, or anything else, should cause any deficiency in that road, the traffic of the Island will be seriously compromised thereby. It is, therefore, I believe, the general wish of the Islanders that the Government should acquire that road, and if the Minister of Justice could in his place give us any hope that in the near future the Government will take steps to acquire that road, the statement would be received with general satisfaction by the people of my province.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think it is an inconvenience that this link should belong to a private company; but I am not able to give any assurance with respect to it further than this—that I will bring the remarks made by the hon. gentleman under the notice of the Government, and will take care that every consideration is given to the inconvenience that he has pointed out, and which, I confess, also, is one requiring consideration.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The inconvenience to the Island of that short road being in the hands of a company must be very great, and I do not think the Government would suffer financially by the operation of that road, if they acquired it.

HON. MR. POWER—There is the more force in the remarks of the hon gentleman from Marshfield for this reason, that, although it does not appear from the present Bill, the fact is that this road has already a subsidy of $3,200 a mile from the Dominion Parliament, and it has, I think, a subsidy of $3,000, from the local legislature. I have been informed by a gentleman in a position to know that the subsidies which that company will now be entitled to receive from the two Governments are sufficient to build the road, and, I think, there is the strongest objection to the Government giving so large a subsidy. It would be much better for the Dominion Government to have built the road instead of voting it $6,400 a mile, and taken, as I presume they could have taken, the local subsidy. The road then would have cost the Gov-

ernment nothing more than now. Now, the public are paying for the road, and it is to be owned by private individuals, who will be in a position, if they choose, to dispose of it and make money out of it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I move the third reading of the Bill. I desire merely to say in reply to what has fallen from the hon. gentleman from Halifax that I put that question to the Minister of Railways a few days since, and he told me that all the subsidies to which the company are entitled would not nearly build the road.

HON. MR. POWER—My informant is a gentleman who lives in the neighborhood, and who is much more familiar with the matter than the Minister of Railways, and his authority, I think, was the President of the Company. I am always glad to see, when so many millions of dollars are being spent in different parts of the Dominion, some money going to Nova Scotia. It is a sentiment that is shared by all the other representatives from the province; and I am naturally pleased to see that in this Bill there is a provision for the payment of the sum of $250,000 for the construction of a railway in Nova Scotia. While that is true, if the Government had proposed to spend so large a sum of money as that for railway purposes in Nova Scotia, there were other localities which had stronger claims to it than the town of Pictou. Pictou is now connected by rail with Truro, and by the Intercolonial Railway with the whole country; and at New Glasgow, which is only some ten miles from Pictou there is a road running down to the Strait of Canso.

HON. MR. CARVELL—I would remind the hon. gentleman that the town of Pictou is not connected by rail with any place in the world. You can connect with the Intercolonial Railway by the steamer that crosses twice a day, or by skiff if you like.

HON. MR. POWER—The harbor has to be crossed; but the harbor of Pictou is connected by rail with the Intercolonial Railway. I am not saying that it is not a desirable thing that this connection should be made; I simply say that in the present condition of things there are other places where the expenditure is more called for. In addition to the existing railway connections which Pictou has, the Short Line Railway from Oxford to Louisburg runs through the county, and it was part of the undertaking of that company to make a connection with the town of Pictou on the same side of the river on which the town stands. That railway has yet to be constructed. There is a large subsidy given to the company, and there is no doubt that it will be constructed. Pictou thus having connections on both sides of the harbor, why should a quarter of a million be voted to give it a third connection? There is in the western part of the province a line of railway some 80 miles in length, which is separated from the railway leading from Halifax and the east by a missing link of some 19 or 20 miles of road rather difficult to construct. If the Government had money to vote for railway purposes in Nova Scotia that link had a claim prior to the road which they have undertaken to construct; but I think in addition to that we have the fact that the Island of Cape Breton with a population of nearly 100,000 has not a single mile of Government railway on it; and I cannot understand why the Government should have selected the county of Pictou to be the recipient of such extraordinary favors when Cape Breton has received nothing whatever.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. POWER—I should like my hon. friend from Alberton to explain that. I think the Government in asking us to vote this money has a right to make some explanation. The Minister of Justice perhaps would not care to tell the secrets of his prison house to the extent of informing us on this point.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—My prison house?

HON. MR. POWER—It has been said that it is in contemplation to call one of the present members from Pictou to the Cabinet. If that be the case, of course I can conceive it is desirable that this $250,000 should be proposed at this time,

as it might be difficult to get the County of Pictou to elect a Conservative without some such inducement.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—If my hon. friend will allow me to tell him in strict confidence, there is nothing in that.

HON. MR. PLUMB—It seems that we are only onlookers in this sort of discussion. The Province of Ontario, the largest province in the Dominion, does not seem to be favored with those grants of money. My hon. friend who has just spoken gets for his province $250,000, while the great Province of Ontario, which is nearly four times as large in population and contributes four or five times as much to the revenue, does not get anything. We are willing to allow the hon. gentlemen to get their $250,000, and settle it amongst themselves, but they ought to be satisfied with it, and it comes with rather bad grace from the hon. gentleman from Halifax to be constantly objecting to all grants that have been made not only to Nova Scotia, but for Nova Scotia; for he has addressed the House three or four times on matters which, if he had his way, would have prevented Nova Scotia from retaining its shipping business, for it works both ways. The direct line enables Nova Scotia to send its imports west, and it is as important to have its imports from the sea as to partake of the inland traffic, and that my hon. friend does not seem to see at all.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—You will always find objections to railway grants unless the railways are brought right to our doors. This railway to Pictou must be a benefit to Prince Edward Island, because a large portion of the trade of Pictou is with the island in the summer, and this railway, crossing and connecting with the Intercolonial Railway, must be an immense advantage to Prince Edward Island. I know that several times I have had occasion to go to Pictou, and have experienced the inconvenience of crossing that ferry. I do not think that this grant is too large, or that that portion of the province is not deserving of it. Cape Breton, for some reason, has not hitherto received the attention that it deserves. It has received subsidies for one road, although that road has not yet been commenced. It is not so much the fault of the Government as it is of the people. We hope our turn will come shortly, however; we commenced a railway sometime ago and we are struggling to complete it, and I hope that our turn will come, and that the road will be completed by the Government in the course of a year or two

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time and passed.

MILITIA LAND GRANTS BILL.

FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (160), "An Act to authorize grants of land to members of the Militia force lately on active service in the North-West" was introduced and read the first and second time under a suspension of the rule.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I think this is a Bill on which we will be unanimous, and it will not receive the criticism, or at least the adverse criticism, even of my hon. friend from Halifax. It is a grant, to those volunteers who have served in the North-West, of 320 acres of land if they choose to remain in that country. It will have the double effect of not only rewarding those who fought our battles there but will have a good influence on the settlement of the country, and in that respect will be useful in both ways. It is proposed, in reference to those who do not want to remain in the North-West, that they shall receive a certain amount of land scrip. Of course there are many volunteers who do not want to remain there, and the temptation we put in their way to persuade them to remain is very considerable. The reward is one that they are justly entitled to, and I am sure the House will sanction it with great pleasure.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I am glad to notice that it is proposed to give the volunteers sections of land in the North-West, in the country where they have been largely instrumental in restoring peace. I regret, however, to find that the Government

limit the time within which it will be competent for parties who propose to accept the gift of the Government to the 1st of August 1886. I can quite understand that those who desire to settle in the country may be entirely precluded from making selections in the short time given. This year is practically gone. They are returning now, and their avocation in the eastern portion of the Dominion will preclude their going there this year again. The time is too short, and I think it is a mistake on the part of the Government. Our ancestors understood this much better. My hon. friend knows very well that when the U. E. Loyalists came to this country and got their grants of land they were not restricted as to time. They and their children had time to make selections. The result of the limitation proposed in this bill is that very considerable numbers of the volunteers will be induced to take scrip and dispose of it, and the country will be deluged with scrip and of course it will run very much below its face value when there is a great deal of it in the market, and our bounty will be restricted very considerably. Eighty dollars of scrip will be equivalent to $40 cash. I have long felt that this issuing of scrip is subject to great abuse. When I was in office I endeavored to make the scrip, which was issued to the half-breeds, non-transferrable and it should only be of value in the hands of the person to whom it is issued, and the land should be taken up only in his name. It is always desirable in cases of this kind to protect people from their own weaknesses. I will not go over this scrip question. I have been familiar with it half a century. We issued scrip after the rebellion of 1837-38, and my hon. friend will recollect when that scrip was issued how it depreciated in value and the people for whom it was intended really got no advantage from it. I think we are making a mistake now, and I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the desirability of legislating so that this will be really a valuable gift to the volunteers. There is no necessity for all this scrip coming back immediately. Why not allow the volunteers a longer time to select and take up lands? We are giving them a substantial area of property. If they do not take it take it up within the time specified we give them scrip for only $80. That $80 will represent, in the hands of a needy person who does not feel inclined to take the land, from $30 to $50. I have known that amount of scrip to be sold for one-tenth of its face value. In fact it is well known that when scrip was issued in the North West it was bought for five or ten dollars, and sometimes even for a bottle of whiskey. In that way the policy of the Government is defeated. It is a question which I take a great interest in, having myself been familiar with its working and having watched its operation. I do feel that it is important to protect people against their own weaknesses. Our object is to give each volunteer a section of land in that country. If they sell it afterwards we cannot help it, but I think it is most desirable that they should really get the patents for their lands. We can say that whether the volunteers part with their scrip or not, the patents shall be issued in the names of the parties entitled to the scrip, just as the patents were issued in the name of the U. E. Loyalists, although some of them had parted with their rights. When a patent was issued it was known that it was the right of Brown, Macdonald, or whatever the name happened to be, and there was no limitation as to time; they were not cut off by being forced to take scrip, and I think my hon. friend would render a most important service to the volunteers if he would call the attention of the Government to this point. I have no doubt that the mistake has been made most inadvertently, at the suggestion of some clerk in the department, that the grant ought to be converted into scrip and taken up at once. We have millions and millions of acres in the North-West, and why should we say to these people you must take up this land before August of next year? It seems an unreasonable thing that a man having a right to land, cannot say, "I will not take it up now, but I have a boy growing up, and he can take it up after he is educated." I say we ought to give the right to take up that land for at least a period of five years, and I have no doubt if attention is called to it at the end of five years, and it should be found necessary to renew the grant, Parliament would readily do so. In adopting that course we should really be conferring substantial benefit upon the country. Otherwise you will find that

three-fourths of the men to whom we give this bounty will reap nothing more than $20 or $25 by selling their scrip to speculators, and the speculator will be the only one benefitted by it. It will give rise to a number of local offices for the purpose of acquiring volunteer scrip. I know all about it, because half a century ago I bought up scrip issued to the volunteers of 1837-38. It is a species of payment only valuable to a man who wants to buy land; it cannot be taken for customs or any other government liability, but only to pay for land, and therefore to give it any practical value the man to whom it is issued has got to find a man who wants to buy the land. We know how that is accomplished. It is by the speculator, who comes between the parties, accumulating a large amount of scrip; he advertises that he has some scrip for sale, and it will be sold in that way. I hope the Government, adopting as they do a really wise policy in giving the volunteers an area of land where we have abundance of it, will seek to secure for the volunteers and their families the benefit and value of that land, and not issue scrip. It is too contemptible to talk of offering the volunteers, who no doubt have made large sacrifices, a money value of $40 or $50, because that is the amount of it, if boiled down in that way. I trust that the month of August will mean five years hence. There is no necessity why the time should not be extended. No argument whatever can be advanced against it. To reach the volunteer you must make this provision, that the patent goes to him. If he chooses to resign it he can do so after the patent is issued for the land.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I think there is a great deal in what the leader of the Opposition says. By this means we are rather depreciating the value of our lands in the North-West. If the scrip will realize only the amount stated by the leader of the Opposition it will be a small amount to pay for 320 acres of land. I think it is not conducive to settlement. The object of this bill is in some tangible way to mark our appreciation of the services of our volunteers and to encourage settlement, and in the encouragement of settlement to give rewards to those men who have done so much for our country. Of course in every way we must appreciate the object and intention of this bill. The grant is not too large, but I think when we come down to scrip, which my hon. friend says would be equal to only $40 for 320 acres, it is really very little for our public lands, and not accomplishing the object we have in view—rewarding the men and promoting the settlement of the country. I do not think the men will squander their scrip in the way the half-breeds and Indians have done. I think they are too sensible to do that. Those from Nova Scotia would be disposed, I think, to settle on the land or find substitutes to settle upon it. At the same time I approve of the sentiments of the hon. member from Ottawa.

HON. MR. READ—I think my hon. friend is mistaken about the volunteers of 1837-38 ever receiving scrip. I was a volunteer myself in that rebellion. The scrip that was issued after that time was to those who had served in the war of 1812 and to their families.

HON. MR. SCOTT—It was issued about 1839 or 1840—just after the rebellion.

HON. MR. READ—Yes, about then, but not to the volunteers of 1837-38. I think it should not go abroad that the volunteers of 1837-38 received scrip. They did not, so far as I know, but the claims of the veterans of 1812-15 were recognized after that time.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL.—I agree in the recollection which my hon. friend from Quinte has on that subject. Like him, I was a volunteer myself and like him I got no land: so it must have been anterior to that. I think the issue was to veterans of the war of 1812, although it took place about 1840. I think the hon. gentleman is also mistaken in supposing that the issue of patents to the U. E. Loyalists took place to themselves or their children. I do not think that was done generally, though it was done in some cases.

HON. MR. SCOTT—What I mean is the rights inured to the parties.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—They were transferred in various ways; so that if Mr. Scott was a U. E. Loyalist and he or his children assigned the right to me I got the patent.

HON. MR. SCOTT—There was no substitution of scrip.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—As to the period during which the holders of this scrip are to bring it in and get land for it, the Bill limits it to August, 1886. The period was prolonged for six months in the other House, at the instance of some one who takes the same view as my hon. friend. At all events there is this to be said: there will be another sitting of Parliament before August, 1886, so that if any wrong is done it can be remedied. The object is to prevent frauds, and that can be done by making persons bring in their scrip. I agree with my hon. friend that those volunteers should get the land and every advantage.

HON. MR. SCOTT—My desire was to call the attention of the Government to this matter. I am quite sure they recognize the valuable services which the volunteers have rendered.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—The scrip issued after 1837-38 was not to the volunteers; it was to indemnify those who had lost property in the rebellion.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is another matter.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—That scrip was speculated in, I know, in a very shameful manner.

HON. MR. FLINT—I happened to have something to do with the troubles of 1837-38. I was called upon by the magistrates of Hastings to supply some 800 volunteers brought into Belleville. I did so, I think, to their perfect satisfaction. After the troubles were over I was elected in 1848 to Parliament, and I know that many parties who had volunteered and who were out on duty for a long time applied to me by letter to try and see if it were possible to get them some land for their services. I know that the Government refused entirely to give anything in connection with it. They said that they could not do so; that if anything was to be done it must be by the Home Government. I know that the scrip which was issued was for lands to the veterans of the war of 1812-15. My hon. friend from Ottawa says he bought scrip; so did I, though not much. I bought two £40 scrip for 100 acres of land each, and I paid £2 10s. for them. I know that no volunteer who served in the rebellion of 1837-38 got any land whatever, or any scrip. The hon. gentleman is in error.

With reference to the rebellion losses, there were many parties paid under the Bill of 1849, and I had a long political battle on that subject. It was shown plainly by the report which was got up and adopted by Conservative members, not those connected with the Baldwin-Lafontaine Government, that no one had received anything—that is, none but those who deserved to receive anything—those who had lost their property in consequence of acts which ought not to have been committed. That is the position in which matters stand as far as the volunteers are concerned—they got nothing. As far as this Bill is concerned we are not doing anything too much for the volunteers. I should like to see more done for them. I think they are deserving of great praise for the course they pursued in turning out, as they did, at an inclement season, going, not through fire and water, but through snow and water—not through whiskey, because they had none, it was not allowed up there. They endured great hardships, much more than people would suppose it possible for young men, brought up as they were, to stand, and I think they have done the country a vast amount of good, not only in quelling the disturbance, but in placing us in a better position towards the United States. It has shown that country that we have some of the backbone in Canada that we had in the war of 1812-15. Therefore, I think it has done us good in many ways. It will show foreign nations that the immigrating masses need have no fear to come and settle in this country. It has opened the eyes of leading men of Great Britain to see that Canada is a valuable adjunct to the British Crown, and they will not be so much set against us here-

after as they have been in the past. We stand in the proud position that even should the Mother Country require help, we will have some men here who will be able and willing to volunteer to go and help them

HON. MR. POWER — I hope the House will allow me to make one observation not on the Bill itself. I quite concur in what has been said by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me as to the desirability of this measure. I was not in the Chamber when there was an opportunity, at an earlier period of the day, to state what I wish to say with respect to losses in the North-West. The Supply Bill contains a large item for the purpose of meeting claims for losses in the recent rebellion. I hope that on that point the Government will exercise a great deal of care. It will be remembered that at the time of the last disturbance in the North West, the Red River trouble, very large sums of money were paid to certain persons for losses which had occurred there, and which everybody who knew anything about it was aware were altogether too great for the losses that had been sustained. It must be remembered that the settlers in the North-West have, some of them, suffered considerable loss, and some of them losses that were inconsiderable, and on the other hand a great many of them have been able to earn large sums of money which they would not have had an opportunity of earning if the outbreak had not taken place; and I hope that the Government in considering the claims for losses will consider also, on behalf of the public, the benefits which many of these people have gained on the other side—that if a man has been placed in a position to earn $500 or $600 and has lost $100 he shall not be paid anything. I have ventured to make this suggestion because I know the Government have been imposed upon heretofore, and the disposition is always to give way to those claims.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the third time and passed.

NAVIGATION OF QUEBEC HARBOR BILL.

FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

A message was received from the House of Commons to inform the Senate that they had passed Bill (159) "An Act for facilitating the navigation of the River St. Lawrence in and near the harbor of Quebed."

The bill was read the first time.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved that the 41st rule be suspended so far as relates to this Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the Bill. He said: This is a Bill to improve the navigation of the harbor of Quebec by allowing the Trinity House Board to blow up the ice if they see fit at the opening of spring navigation.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second and third times and passed.

ADDITIONAL COUNTY COURT JUDGE IN MANITOBA BILL.

FIRST SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

A Message was received from the House of Commons to inform the Senate that they had passed bill (162), "An Act to provide a salary for an additional county court Judge in the province of Manitoba."

The Bill was read the first time.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the suspension of the 41st rule as far as relates to this Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the Bill. He said: This Bill is for the purpose of providing a salary for an additional county court Judge in the eastern district of Manitoba. The salary mentioned in the Bill is $2,000, which is the ordinary salary given to judges at the commencement of their career.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second and third times and passed.

The Senate adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Monday, July 20th, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 1:30 p.m.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

The House adjourned during pleasure.

THE PROROGATION.

This day at Two o'clock p.m., HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL proceeded in state to the Chamber of the Senate, in the Parliament Buildings, and took his seat upon the Throne. The Members of the Senate being assembled, His Excellency was pleased to command the attendance of the House of Commons, and that House being present, the following Bills were assented to, in Her Majesty's name, by His Excellency the Governor General, viz :—

An Act to incorporate the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.

An Act further to amend the Acts incorporating the Richelieu Navigation Company, and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.

An Act to amend the sections of Acts therein mentioned, relating to the constitution of the Treasury Board.

An Act for granting certain powers to the Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Insurance Association.

An Act to incorporate the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Navigation Company.

An Act for the relief of George Branford Cox.

An Act to amend the Act intituled "An Act to provide for the employment without the walls of common gaols, of prisoners sentenced to imprisonment therein."

An Act to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.

An Act further to amend the Acts relating to Weights and Measures.

An Act respecting Infectious or Contagious Diseases affecting Animals.

An Act to incorporate the Fort McLeod Ranche Telegraph Company.

An Act to amend an Act respecting "The Central Prison for the Province of Ontario."

An Act to amend and consolidate the Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883, and 1884.

An Act respecting proof of entries in Books of Account kept by Officers of the Crown.

An Act to authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the Public Service.

An Act respecting the Commercial Bank of Windsor.

An Act to provide for the fitting representation of Canada at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, to be held in London in the year 1886.

An Act respecting "The Bank of British Columbia."

An Act further to amend "The Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882."

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.

An Act respecting Agricultural Fertilizers.

An Act further to amend "An Act for the better Preservation of the Peace in the vicinity of Public Works," and the Acts in amendment thereof.

An Act further to amend an Act intituled, 'An Act respecting offences against the person.'

An Act respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.

An Act respecting Canned Goods.

An Act further to amend "The General Inspection Act, 1874," and the Acts amending the same.

An Act to authorize the augmentation of the North-West Mounted Police.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the appointment of a Harbor Master at the Port of Halifax.

An Act respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricu'tural Fertilizers.

An Act to amend the Act in relation to the Library of Parliament.

An Act to authorize the grant of certain subsidies in land for the construction of the railways therein mentioned.

An Act respecting "The Liquor License Act, 1883."

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company.

An Act to amend "The Consolidated Militia Act of 1883."

An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise.

An Act for the final settlement of the Claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion.

An Act to modify the application of "The Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877."

An Act to authorize the advance of a certain sum to the Harbor Commissioners of Three Rivers.

An Act further to amend the Act relating to the Culling and Measuring of Timber in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

An Act to amend "The Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883."

An Act to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into Canada.

An Act respecting the administration of Justice, and other matters, in the North-West Territories.

An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to provide for the completion and successful operation thereof.

An Act to authorize the granting of further subsidies to and making further provision for the construction and efficient operation of the Railways therein described.

An Act to amend the several Acts relating to Duties of Customs and Excise.

An Act to amend the Act forty-sixth Victoria, chapter nine, intituled: "An Act to provide for the salaries and superannuation and travelling allowances of certain Judges of certain Provincial Courts."

An Act to continue for a limited time the Act therein mentioned.

An Act for facilitating navigation of the River St. Lawrence, in and near the Harbor of Quebec.

An Act to provide a salary for an additional County Court Judge in the Province of Manitoba.

An Act to authorize the granting of the Subsidies therein mentioned, in aid of the construction of certain Railways.

An Act to authorize grants of land to members of the Militia Force lately on active service in the North-West.

Then the Hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor-General as follows:

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

"The Commons of Canada have voted the supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the public service.

"In the name of the Commons I present to Your Excellency the following Bills:

'An Act for granting to Her Majesty the sum of $1,700,000, required for defraying certain expenses now being incurred in connection with the troubles in the North-West Territories.'

'An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1885, and the 30th June, 1886, and for other purposes relating to the public service,' to which Bills I humbly request Your Excellency's assent."

To these Bills the Royal assent was signified in the following words:—

"In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor-General thanks Her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these Bills."

After which His Excellency the Governor-General was pleased to close the THIRD SESSION of the FIFTH PARLIAMENT of the DOMINION with the following

SPEECH:

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I desire to convey to you my best thanks for the diligence with which you have performed your duties during this long protracted Session.

It has been in many respects an eventful Session—in none more so than because since its commencement the peaceful progress of the Dominion, unbroken for so many years, has been interrupted by a serious insurrectionary outbreak in the North-West Territories.

I congratulate you upon the prompt and complete suppression of these disorders and on the restoration of public confidence throughout the regions in which they occurred.

The insurrection has been encountered by the Military Force of the Dominion under Major General Middleton in a manner deserving of the highest commendation.

The courage which our citizen soldiers have shown in the face of a formidable and determined enemy, their cheerful endurance of privation and fatigue, and the readiness with which they have submitted to sacrifices, inevitable whenever a force composed of citizens of all classes is called upon to relinquish the enjoyments of civil life, reflects the highest credit upon them.

I am gratified to find that both Houses of Parliament have considered the conduct of Major-General Middleton and the officers and men under his command deserving of their formal thanks. It has been my agreeable duty to bring under the notice of Her Majesty's Government the value of the services which have been thus rendered to the Empire.

I cannot leave this subject without expressing my sorrow that the success of our arms should have been purchased at the cost of many lives which Canada could ill afford to spare. The memory of those who have fallen either on the field or from sickness contracted during their service will be gratefully cherished throughout the Dominion.

It affords me much pleasure to acknowledge the prompt action of the Government of the United States in taking the precautions necessary in order to prevent any co-operation with the insurgents from their frontiers.

The measure for the adjustment of the representation of the people in Parliament will extend the franchise to numbers who have not hitherto enjoyed the right of voting for the election of members of the House of Commons, and render such representation free from frequent changes by the unconcerted action of the Provincial Legislatures.

The settlement of all matters in discussion between the Federal Government and that of Manitoba will, I trust, satisfy the expectations of the people of that Province.

The Bill regulating the influx of the Chinese people into Canada will, I doubt not, allay the feeling of discontent in relation to that subject which has for some time prevailed in British Columbia.

The aid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will secure the advantages which are justly expected from the completion of that great enterprise, whilst the grants in land and money to other railways in various

portions of Canada may be expected to accelerate the progress of settlement and augment the commerce of the Dominion.

The ready conversion of our five per cent. bonds, which have recently matured, into four per cent. securities, and the success of the loan for four millions of pounds sterling, lately offered in the London market, show the satisfactory state of the credit of Canada.

I congratulate you on the other useful measures, both of a public and private nature, which you have passed.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In Her Majesty's name I thank you for the supplies you have granted for the public service.

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The readjustment of the tariff will tend to increase the revenue and enable the Government to meet the various engagements of the country.

I now with reiterated thanks relieve you for the present from your important duties.

The SPEAKER of the Senate then said:

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate and Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Saturday, the twenty-ninth day of August next, to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Saturday, the twenty-ninth day of August next.

INDEX

—TO—

DEBATES OF THE SENATE.

SESSION 1885.

PART I. constitutes an Index to the names of Senators with their action upon the respective subjects. In this part *italics* denote that the Motion, Amendment or Inquiry in question emanated from the Senator mentioned.

PART II. constitutes an analytical index to all the subjects debated. Names in *italics* and parenthesis after the subject indicate the *movers*.

The following abreviations have been employed: Amt., Amendment; Appt., Appointment; B., Bill; Com., Committee; Concurr., Concurrence; Corresp., Correspondence; Dischgd., Discharged; Div'n, Division; H.E., His Excellency; H.M., Her Majesty; Incorp., Incorporation; Inqy., Inquiry; M., Motion; *m.*, moved; Res., Resolution; Ry., Railway; W., Whole House, thus Com. of W., Committee of Whole House; Withdr., Withdrawn.

On a Division:—C., Contents; N.-C., Non-Contents.

1st R., 2nd R., 3rd R., 1st, 2nd and 3rd Reading.

*, Without comment or discussion.

I.—INDEX TO SENATORS.

ALEXANDER, HON. GEORGE.

Absence of Ministers from the Capital.
On Mr Power's motion for address, 169.

Address, in debate on the.
Remarks, 10.

Adjournment—Easter holidays.
Remarks, 454.

Adjournment, (May 8th—20th).
On Mr. Bellerose's motion, 920.

Adjournment, (June 20th—July 2nd).
Remarks, 1088.

Bank of Upper Canada, Debt due to Govt. by.
Enquiry, 35.

Bank of Upper Canada, as to the realization of assets.
M. for Com., 58-68.

Bank of Upper Canada, assets of.
M. for return postponed, 480.

Bank of Upper Canada, Investigation into affairs of.
M. for Com., 599; Question of Order therein, 600; M. withdrawn, 619.

Brantford, Waterloo & Lake Erie Incorp. B. (59).
On 3rd R., 466.

British Columbia, White Population of, Explanation and Correction.
22.

Canadian Pacific Railway, criticisms upon.
12.

Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
On 2nd R., 714
In Com., 879.

Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
On 2nd R., 830; In Com., 904.

Debates of the Senate, Circulation of.
24.

Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons B. (26).
In Com., 115; On 3rd R., 122.

Divorce Committee, Publication of Evidence before.
Remarks, 329.

Grand Trunk Railway, injustice done to by Government complained of.
11.

Globe correspondent and the Senate.
Inquiry, 458.

Half-breed Claims in the North-West.
On Mr. Trudel's M. for Return, 644.

Half-breed Grievances in the North-West, Correspondence in relation to.
M. for Return, 1029.

Huron & Ontario Ship Canal Co's B. (69).
On 2nd R., 614.

Indians in the North-West, Correspondence concerning.
On Mr. Schultz's M. for Return, 595.

Industries and Manufactures of Canada, Report upon.
On Mr. Macdonald's Enquiry; Remarks, 289-291.

Legislation in the Senate, Joint Com. upon.
On Sir Alex. Campbell's M., 706.

Messengers, Complaint as to the deficiency of.
Remarks, 105.

North-West Troubles, Half-breed Claims.
M. for Return agreed to, 523.

North-West Territories, Disposal of Lands in.
On Mr. Wark's Inquiry, 844.

North-West Rebellion, Provision for Families of Volunteers killed and wounded in.
Inquiry, 937.

North-West Rebellion, Correspondence in relation thereto.
M. for Return, 1012; Quest. of Order as to Reading Speech, 1013.

Order, Question of, on Mr. Howlan's Remarks.
Remarks, 846.

Parliamentary Returns, Number and Expenses of.
On Mr. Flint's M. for Return, 517.

Personal position defined.
Remarks, 10.

Portrait of Sir David Macpherson, Removal of, from Senate corridors.
Motion, 45.

Privilege, Question of, as to *Mail* newspaper.
480.

Privilege, Question of, as to expunging of his Speech from the Reports.
239, 241; Called to order, 242.

Public Affairs of the Dominion.
M. relating thereto postponed, 514; Further postponed, 555, 705, 735; Ruled out of order, 817.
Public Loan B. (145).
On 2nd R., 1049; On 3rd R., 1070.
Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
On 2nd R., 199; In Com., 362; On Mr. Scott's Amt., 376.
Short Line Railway.
Remarks on Mr. Power's M. for address for copies of Reports of Surveys, &c., 347.
Strangers, exclusion of, from Senate corridors.
Remarks, 105.
Statutes, Consolidation of, Appointment of Joint Com. upon.
Remarks, 321.
Treaties with the Indians in the North-West.
On Mr. Read's Inquiry, 809.
Vote of Censure proposed by Sir Alex. Campbell.
Explanation and apology, 219.

Allan, Hon. George William.
Bank of Upper Canada, debt due Government by.
On Mr. Alexander's Enquiry, 36.
Bank of Upper Canada.
On Mr. Alexander's M. for Com., 65.
Bank du Peuple B. (53).
Rep. from Com., 579; On 3rd R., 585.
Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
On 3rd R., 978-81.
Central Bank of New Brunswick B. (40).
Rep. from Com., 640.
Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
Rep. from Com., 914.
Chinese Immigration Restriction and Regulation B. (155).
On 2nd R., 1296.
Dominion Grange Fire Ins. Ass. B. (55).
Rep. from Com., 841.
Federal Bank B. (10).
1st R.*, 256; 2nd R. *m*, 268.
Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. (139).
In Com., 1169.
Maritime Court of Ontario Jurisdiction B. (11).
Rep. from Com., 554, 565.
North-West Rebellion, Vote of thanks to Gen. Middleton, the Militia, &c.
Remarks, 1394.
Winnipeg Bank Incorp. Act Amt. B. (62).
Rep. from Com., 640.

Almon, Hon. William J
Adjournment, Easter holidays.
Remarks, 454.
Adjournment suggested.
Remarks, 822.
Canada Congregational Missionary Socy's B. (54).
On 3rd R., 408.
Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
On postpmt. of 2nd R., 623; On 2nd R. 674-8; In Com., 866, &c.; Amt. *m* 893; On Postpmt. of 3rd R., 925 Further Postpmt., 932
Canada Temperance Act; Commission of Enquiry into working of.
Petition for presented and read, 617.
Chinese Immigration Restriction and Regulation B. (155).
On 2nd R., 1295; In Com., 1326; Explanation after 3rd R., 1411.
Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
In Com., 909.
Cox Divorce B.
On Postpmt. of 2nd R., 406.
Davis Divorce B. (C).
On Rep. of Com., 130; On 3rd R., 155.
Divorce Committees, Publication of Evidence before.
Remarks, 325.
Explosive Substances B. (K).
In Com., 278.
Judge Rigby, Petition against.
Presented and withdrawn, 108.
Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
On Mr. Plumb's M., 632.
Offences against the Person Act Amt. B. (S).
On 2nd R., 726.
Offences against the Person B. (S).
In Com., 786; On Concurr. in Amts., 813; On 3rd R., 823.
Pawnbrokers' B. (R).
In Com., 737.
Preservation of Peace near Public Works Act Amt. B. (O)
On 2nd R, 596.

Railway Subsidies B. (158).
On 2nd R., 1404.
Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
In Com., 264, 272.
Sable Island, Life-saving Service at.
Inquiry, 641.
Smith Divorce Bill.
As to Selection of Com., 54.
Temperance Legislation, Petition regarding.
Presentation of, 578.

Baillargeon, Hon. Pierre.
Short Line Railway.
Remarks on Mr Power's M. for address for copies of Reports of Surveys, &c., 346.

Bellerose, Hon. Joseph H.
Address, in Debate on the.
Remarks, 20.
Adjournment, (February 13th—20th).
Motion, 49.
Adjournment, (May 8th—20th).
Notice of M., 851; M. carried, 918-23.
Adjournment, (June 1st).
M. carried, 1033.
Adjournment, (June 12th).
M. carried, 1047.
Complains because neither mover nor seconder of the Address spoke in French.
19.
Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B. (153).
In Com., 1367.
Consolidated Militia Act Amt. B. (152).
On 3rd R., 1289.
Divorce Committees, Publication of Evidence before.
Remarks, 328.
Dry Dock Construction Act Amt B. (108).
Rep. from Com., 622.
Electoral Franchise B. (103).
On 2nd R., 1206-1216; Question of Order raised as to relevancy of Remarks, 1214; On 3rd R., 1332; Amt. (in reference to Quebec) *m*, 1341; Amt. (as to voters' lists) *m*, 1342.
Half-breed Claims in the North-West.
On Mr. Trudel's M. for return, 649.
Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
On Mr. Plumb's M., 658.
Legislation in the Senate, Joint Com. upon.
On Sir Alex. Campbell's M., 710.
Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. (139).
On 2nd R., 1110.
Manitoba Claims Final Settlement B. (155).
Rep. from Com., 1329.
North-West Rebellion, Vote of thanks to Gen. Middleton, the Militia, &c.
Remarks, 1396.
Order, Question of, as to Mr. Plumb's. Remarks in discussing the Franchise Bill.
Remarks, 1221.
Protests against method of Hon. Mr. Robitaille's appointment to the Senate.
20.
Parliamentary Returns, Number and Expenses of.
On Mr. Flint's M. for Return, 514.
Prince Edward Island, Communication with.
On Mr. Howlan's Inquiry, 507.
Railway Subsidies B. (158).
On 2nd R., 1407; In Com. Amt. (to 1st clause) lost on div., 1415; On 3rd R. same Amt. ruled out of order, 1419.
Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
In Com., 262.
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Investigation.
M. for Return, 555.
Short Line Railway.
Remarks on Mr. Power's M. for address for Copies of Reports of Surveys, &c., 344.
Summary Proceedings B, (I).
On 2nd R., 393.
Treaties with Indians in the North-West.
On Mr. Reade's Inquiry, 801.
Veterans of the War of 1812.
Petitions for Pensions presented, 1274.

Bolduc, Hon. Joseph.
Summoned to the Senate and introduced.
3.

Botsford, Hon. Amos Edwin.
Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. (92).
On Mr. Power's Amt. before going into Com., 853.

Cape Traverse Branch Railway.
M. for Return, 370.

Explosive Substances B. (K).
Rep. from Com., 279.

Hatzfeld Divorce B. (D).
Petition of Respondent for maintenance presented and ref. to Com., *m*, 130.

Huron & Ontario Ship Canal Co's B.
Suspension of 51st Rule, *m*, 157.

Legislation in the Senate, Joint Com. upon.
On Sir Alex. Campbell's M., 707.

Offences against the Person B. (F).
Reported from Com., 108.

Order, Question of.
On Mr. Alexander's M. in re Bank of Upper Canada; Remarks on Speaker's Ruling, 619.

Prince Edward Island, Communication with.
On Mr. Howlan's Inquiry, 507.

Privilege, Question of.
As to Expunging of Mr. Alexander's speech from the Reports. Attention called to presence of strangers, 242.

Public Loan B. (145).
On 2nd R., 1050.

Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
In Com., 272.

Sewerage and Ventilation of Senate Building.
Remarks upon, 1045.

Smith Divorce Bill.
As to selection of Com , 55.

Vote of Censure upon Mr. Alexander.
Remarks, 220.

BOUCHERVILLE, HON. C. E. BOUCHER DE.

Debates Reporting Com.
Adoption of Reports *m*; 1st Rep., 735; 2nd Rep. (additional appropriations) 1293.

Electoral Franchise B. (103).
In Com., 1276; On 3rd R., 1337; Amt. (as to definition of "person") *m*, 1343; Amt. (as to Christian Chinamen) *m*, 1343.

Food, Drugs, &c., Adulteration B. (W).
Rep. from Com., 1044.

Liquor License Act 1883 Amt. B. (134).
Rep. from Com., 1272.

Privilege, Question of.
As to expunging of Mr. Alexander's speech from the Reports, 240.

Railway Subsidy B. (158).
In Com., 1415-16; On 3rd R., 1419.

CAMPBELL, HON. SIR ALEXANDER.

Absence of Ministers from the Capital.
Mr. Power's M. for Address refused, 169.

Addition of Hon. Mr. Poirier's name to Committees.
352.

Adjournment, Easter holidays.
Motion, 454.

Adjournment suggested.
Reply to Mr. Power, 822.

Adjournment (May 8th—20th).
On Mr. Bellerose's M., 919.

Adjournment (Queen's Birthday).
Motion, 945.

Adjournment (June 20th—July 2nd)
Mr. McInnes' M. agreed to, 1088.

Adjournment (June 3rd—22nd)
Mr. Nelson's M. not agreed to, 1038; Adj. (June 3rd—10th) agreed to, 1039.

Administration of Justice in North-West Territories B. (V).
1st R.*, 931; 2nd R. *m*, 942; In Com., 1025-29; 3rd R. *m*, 1033; Amts. of H. of C. agreed to, *m*, 1396.

Administration of Criminal Justice in Disputed Territory B. (165).
1st R.* and Suspension of 41st Rule, *m*, 1412; 2nd and 3rd Rs.*, 1413.

Advances to the Provinces B. (7).
1st R.*, 564; 2nd R. *m*, 598; 3rd R., 615.

Agricultural Fertilizers B. (122).
1st R.*, 1051; 2nd R. *m*, 1084; In Com., 1087; 3rd R.*, 1087.

Bank of Upper Canada, Debt due Government by.
On Mr. Alexander's Inquiry, 44.

Bank of Upper Canada.
On Mr. Alexander's M. for Com., 61.

British Columbia Bank B. (105).
1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R. *m*, 1054; 3rd R.*, 1083.

British Medical Acts.
On Mr. Sullivan's M. for return, 48.

Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt B. (92).
On 2nd R, 732; In Com., 855-898; On Concurr. in Amts., 917; Postpmt. of 3rd R. *m*, 923; Further Postpmt, 932; 3rd R. *m*, 946; 975, Consideration of Senate Amts. postponed, 1096; Senate Amts. insisted upon, 1155-1167.

Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B. (153).
2nd R. *m*, 1305-18; In Com., 1344-1369; On M. for 3rd R. Amt. *m*, 1369; 3rd R. *m*, 1370; On Mr. Power's Amt., 1384; On Mr. McInnes' Amt., 1385.

Canadian Pacific Railway Terminus in British Columbia.
In Reply to Mr. McInnes' M. for Return, 1137.

Canned Goods Bill (V).
1st R.*, 898; 2nd R. *m*, 930; In Com., 933-36; 3rd R. postponed, 988; Further postpmt., 990; 3rd R. *m*, 1024; Concurr. in Commons' Amts. *m*, 1119.

Cape Traverse Branch Railway.
Mr. Botsford's M. for Return agreed to, 373.

Chapais, Senator, the late.
Remarks concerning, 1388.

Chinese Immigration Restriction and Regulation B. (155).
1st R., 1193; 2nd R. *m*, 1295-1299; In Com., 1326; 3rd R.*, 1410; Reply to Mr. Almon's Remarks, 1412.

Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
2nd R. *m*, 825; In Com., 899-914; 3rd R. *m*, 927; Amt. not insisted upon, 1046.

Colonial and Indian Exhibition B. (126).
1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R. *m*, 1052; In Com., 1086; 3rd R.*, 1086.

Commercial Bank of Windsor B. (117).
1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R. *m*, 1051; 3rd R.*, 1083.

Consolidation of Dominion Statutes.
M. for reference to a Select Com. postponed, 80.

Consolidated Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. (146).
1st R.*, 1143; 2nd R. *m*, 1192; In Com., 1293; 3rd R. *m*, 1305.

Consolidated Insurance Act 1877 Modification B. (20).
1st R., 1093; 2nd R. *m*, 1151; In Com., 1177-1181; 3rd R. *m*, 1194.

Consolidated Militia Act 1883 Amt. B. (152).
1st R.*, 1193; 2nd R. *m*, 1273; 3rd R. *m*, 1287, 1290.

Consolidated Railway Act 1879 Amt. B. (Q).
1st R., 649; 2nd R., 685; In Com., 733; Bill dropped, 990.

Cox Divorce Case.
As to Compliance with rules, 25.
As to Sufficiency of affidavit of service of Petition, 31.
As to dispensing with rules, 34.

Cox Divorce Bill.
Suspension of 72nd Rule opposed, and B. sent back to Com, 50.
On Postponement of 2nd R. 406.
Proof of Service, &c., 664.

Crown Accounts Books, Proof of Entries in B. (M).
1st R.*, 352; 2nd R. *m*, 407; 3rd R.*, 412, Consideration of Common's Amts., 1047; Concurr. in Amts. *m*, 1082.

Criminal Law, Codification of.
Intention of Government, 48.

Customs and Excise Act Amt. B. (157).
1st R.*, 1397; 2nd and 3rd R's, *m*, 1414.

Davis Divorce Case.
Objection as to sufficiency of notice, made and withdrawn, 27.
As to exam. of Petitioner, 57.

Davis Divorce B. (C).
On M. for 2nd R., 103; On Rep. of Com., 129; On 3rd R., 156.

Death of Senator Benson.
M. for Adjournment, 350.

Deputy Speaker for House of Commons B. (26).
1st R.*, 108; 2nd R. *m*, 114; In Com., 115; 3rd R *m*, 122.

Divorce Cases.
As to proper preparation of papers in, 104.

Divorce Cases.
As to Change of Procedure in, 110.

Divorce Committees, Presence of Strangers at.
Remarks, 323.

Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Ins. Assm. B. (55).
On. 2nd R., 686.

Dry Dock Construction Act Amt. B. (108).
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 513; In Com., 622; 3rd R., 622.

Electoral Franchise B. (103).
1st R.*, 1168; 2nd R. *m*, 1194-1200; In Com., 1276-1287; 3rd R. *m*, 1329.

Evans Divorce Case.
As to the evidence of service of the Petition, 30.

Evans Divorce B. (G).
As to clause providing for custody of child, 113.

Evans Divorce B. (G).
On M. for 3rd R., 365.

Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. (6).
On 2nd R., 576.

Evidence in Divorce Cases, Printing and Publication of.
Motion, 322.

Explosive Substances B. (K).
1st R.*, 179; 2nd R. *m*, 221; In Com., 276; 3rd R. *m*, 280.

Food, Drugs, &c., Adulteration B. (W).
1st R.*, 931; 2nd R. *m*, 944; In Com.,

1039-44; 3rd R. *m*, 1044; Concurr. in Commons' Amts. *m*, 1118, 1167.

France and Canada, Steam communication between.
Reply to Mr. Pelletier's Inquiry, 664.

Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt B. (119).
1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R.*, 1082; 3rd R., 1085.

General Inspection Act 1874 Amt. B. (135).
1st R.*, 1,088; 2nd R. *m*., 1,090; In Com., 1,097-1,108, 1,119-1,122; 3rd R.*, 1,122.

Globe Correspondent and the Senate.
Reply to Mr. Alexander's Inquiry, 459.

Half-Breed Troubles in the North-West.
Reply to Mr. Scott's Inquiry, 410.

Half-breed Grievances in the North-West, Correspondence in relation to,
Reply to Mr. Alexander's M. for Ret., 1,031.

Halifax Harbor Master's Act Amt. B. (148).
1st R., 1,093; 2nd R. *m*., 1,108; In Com., 1,167; 3rd R. *m*. 1,168.

Halifax Volunteers, Transportation of,
Reply to Mr. Power's Inquiry, 536.

Halifax Volunteers, Transportation of,
Explanation, 562.

Hatzfeld Divorce Case.
As to sufficiency of service of notice, 32.

Hatzfeld Divorce B. (D).
On 2nd R., 117; on Ref. to Com., 120; on 1st Rep. of Com., 121.

Hudson's Bay, Exports from,
Mr. Schultz's M. for Return agreed to, 199.

Hydrographic Surveys in the North-West.
On Mr. Schultz's Inquiry, 48.

Indians in the North-West, Correspondence concerning.
Mr. Schultz's M. for Return agreed to, 595.

Industries and manufactures of Canada, Report upon.
On Mr. Macdonald's enquiry, 145, 154, 155.

Infectious and Contagious Diseases Affecting Animals B. (41).
1st R., 735; 2nd R., *m*, 790; In Com., 839; 3rd R. *m*, 840.

Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co's, &c., Act Amt. B. (N).
On 2nd R., 488.

Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
Mr. Plumb's M. postponed, 179; debate postponed, 597; remarks, 653-58, 662.

Legislation in the Senate, Formation of Joint Committee upon.
M, and remarks, 705.

Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. (139).
1st R., 1,095; M. for 2nd R., 1,095; 2nd R. *m*, 1,108, 1,113; In Com., 1,168-1,171; 3rd R.*, 1,171.

Liquor License Act 1883 B. (134).
1st R.*, 1,122; 2nd R. *m*, 1,171; In Com., 1,272; 3rd R., 1,273.

Lionel Garnham's Case.
Reply to Mr. Haythorne's Inquiry, 389.

Lutheran Church Synod Incorp. B. (60).
On 2nd R., 530.

Joint Com. on Division of Business, Progress of.
Reply to Mr. Wark's Enquiry, 1,034.

Judge Rigby, Petition against.
Reply to Mr. Almon, 108.

Manitoba County Court Additional Judge B. (162).
1st R.*; suspension of 41st rule and 2nd and 3rd R's *m*, 1,429.

Manitoba Lands, Copy of Patent issued to Mrs. Lonsdale.
Mr. Guevremont's M. for Ret. agreed to, 1,047.

Manitoba Province Claims Final Settlement B. (155).
1st R.*, 1,193; 2nd R. *m*, 1,301; 3rd R., 1,329.

Manitoba and North-Western Railway Co's B. (74).
On 2nd R., 687.

Maritime Court of Ontario Jurisdiction Extension B. (11).
1st R.*, 382; 2nd R. *m*, 512; In Com., 531-34; On 3rd R., 565,

Members of the Royal Society and the Civil Service Examinations.
Reply to Mr. Trudel's Enquiry, 409.
See also p. 428.

Militia Force Land Grant B. (160).
1st R*, 2nd R.* *m* and 3rd R., 1,425.

Morning Sitting of the Senate.
Motion, 1,388.

"Northern Light," Instructions to Commander of.
On Mr. Haythorne's M. for Return, 84.

North-West Rebellion, Telegram about Frog Lake Massacre read.
513.

North-West Rebellion, Provision for Families of Volunteers Killed or Wounded in.
On Mr. Alexander's Inquiry, 939.

North-West Rebellion, Correspondence in relation to.
Reply to Mr. Trudel's Inquiry, 1,035.

North-West Rebellion. Official report of General Middleton presented. 1,168.

North-West Rebellion, Assistance to Sufferers.
In Reply to Mr. Trudel's Enquiry, 1,274.

North-West Rebellion—Trials at Regina, Conduct of.
In Reply to Mr. Trudel's Enquiry, 1,274.

North-West Rebellion—Vote of Thanks to General Middleton, the Militia, &c.
Motion, 1,390.

North-West Rebellion—Investigation by Govt. into causes of, Extent of Damage, &c.
Reply to Mr. Trudel, 1,410.

North-West Rebellion Expenses B. (149).
1st R.*, 1,093; 2nd R. *m*, 1,150; 3rd R. *m*, 1,168.

North-West Territories, Superintendents of Education in the.
Reply to Mr. Schultz's Inquiry, 199.

North-West, Representation of the, in the Cabinet.
Reply to Mr. Schultz's Enquiry, 158.

North-West Territories, Disposal of Lands in.
In Reply to Mr. Wark, 844.

North-West Mounted Police Force B.
1st R.*, 791; 2nd R. *m*, 840; 3rd R., 851.

North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. (144).
1st R., 1,093; 2nd R. *m*, 1,114; 3rd R. *m*, 1,150.

North-West Territories Census B. (21).
1st R.*, 111; 2nd R. *m*, 123; In Com., 279; 3rd R. *m*, 331.

Offences against the Person Act Amendment B. (F).
1st R. and M. for 2nd R., 48; 2nd R. *m*, 57; 3rd R. *m*, 481.

Offences against the Person B. (S).
In Com., 785.

Ontario Central Prison Act Amt. B. (P).
1st R.*, 523; 2nd R., 597; 3rd R., 615.

Order—Objection to Mr. Alexander's Speaking Twice on an Inquiry, 44.

Order—Point of Order Raised as to Relevancy of Mr. Alexander's Remarks, 46.

Order, Question of, on Mr. Alexander's Remarks, 707.

Parliamentary Returns, Number and Expense of,
Mr. Flint's M. for Return amended and agreed to, 516.

Pawnbroker's B. (R).
In Com. 731.

Petitions for Private Bills, Extension of time for receiving.
m, 51.

Pontiac & Pacific Junction Railway matters.
Mr. Trudel's M. for Return agreed to, 1,093.

Pontiac & Pacific Junction Railway, Cost of.
Mr. Trudel's M. for Return agreed to, 1,411.

Port Moody Engine House, Building of.
Reply to Mr. McInnes' Enquiry, 1,047.

Public Affairs of the Dominion.
On Mr. Alexander's Inquiry, question of order raised, 817.

Public Loan B. (145).
1st R.* and M. for 2nd R., 1,048; 3rd R., 1,055, 1,063.

Preservation of Peace near Public Works Act Amt. B. (O).
1st R.*, 523; 2nd R., 596; In Com. and 3rd R., 623.

Prince Edward Island, Winter Communication with.
Reply to Mr. Haythorne's Enquiry, 82.

Prince Edward Island, Winter Communication with.
Information as to boat houses, 410.

Prince Edward Island, Communication with.
On Mr. Howlan's Inquiry, 511.

Printing Com's 2nd Report, Adoption of, Postponed, 49.

Privilege, Question of,
As to expunging Mr. Alexander's speech from the reports, 241; Mr. Alexander called to order, 242.

Privilege, Question of,
Explanation to Mr. Haythorne, 466.

Prisoners' Employment Act Amt. B. (81).
1st R.*, 898; 2nd R. *m*, 931; 3rd R. *m*, 932.

Provincial Courts Judges' Salaries Acts Amt. B. (161).
1st R.*, 1,397; 2nd and 3rd R's, 1414.

Quebec Harbor Navigation B. (159).
1st R.*; suspension of 41st rule *m*; 2nd and 3rd R's *m*, 1,429.

Question of Order raised as to Mr. Alexander's remarks on M. to adjourn, 456.

Railways, An Act relating to.
1st R.* 5.

Railway Survey Reports, Bringing down of.
Reply to Mr. Power's Inquiry, 822.

Railway Land Subsidies B. (147).
1st R., 1,093; M. for 2nd R., 1,093; 2nd R. *m*, 1,150; In Com., 1,176; 3rd R., 1,177.

Railway Subsidies B. (158).
2nd R*, 1,398; In Com., 1415-17; 3rd R. *m*, 1417.

Railway Subsidies B. (164).
1st R.* and 2nd R. *m*, 1,422; 3rd R. *m*, 1,424.

Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
1st R.*, 22; 2nd R. *m*, 70-79, 204-208; In Com., 242, 248, 252, 253, 257; Mr. Power's suggested Amt. to 12th clause accepted, 259; Mr. Scott's Amt. to 22nd clause accepted, 263, 264, 265, 269, 270; Amt. to 72nd clause *m*, 274, 352, 357, 359; Amt. to 22nd clause *m*, 361, 363; Amt. to 127th clause *m*, 365, 373; Concurr. in Amts. *m*, 374; Mr. Scott's Amt., striking out 8th clause not accepted, 374; Mr. Trudel's Amts. to 12th clause not accepted, 380; Mr. Dickey's Amt. to 91st clause not accepted, 381; 3rd R. *m*, 382.

Rebellion in the North-West—Proclamation to Rebels.
Reply to Mr. Haythorne's Inquiry, 723.

Red River, Dredging the Mouth of.
Reply to Mr. Schultz's Enquiry, 256.

Registration of Medical Practitioners.
On Mr. Sullivan's M. for Address, 453.

Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Navigation Co's B.
As to presentation of petition, 130.

Sable Island, Life-saving Service at.
Reply to Mr. Almon's Inquiry, 643.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Investigation.
Mr. Bellerose's M. for Return agreed to, 561

Secretary of State Department Acts Amt. B. (102).
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 536; 3rd R., 598.

Sewerage and Ventilation of Senate Building.
Reply to Remarks upon, 1,045.

Short Line Railway.
Mr. Power's M. for address for reports of surveys, &c., agreed to, 350.

Short Line Railway, Route provided for.
Reply to Mr. Power's Inquiry, 1,149.

Short Line Railway, Petitions for a Survey, &c.
Mr. Power's M. for Return agreed to, 1,192.

Simpson, Hon. Mr., Death of, announced, 427.

Smith Divorce Case.
Notice declared sufficient, 28.

Smith Divorce Bill.
As to examination of witnesses, 52; as to selection of committee, 55.

South-Western Railway, Construction of.
Reply to Mr. Reesor's Enquiry, 410.

Speech from the Throne.
Consideration of *m**, 5.

Statutes, Consolidation of, Appointment of Joint Com. upon.
Motion, 302-321.

Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. (133).
1st R*, 1,047; 2nd R*, 1,082; In Com., 1,085; 3rd R., 1,085.

Summary Proceedings B. (L).
On 2nd R., 403.
In Com., 481-87; 525-26.

The Supply B. (163).
1st R.*; suspension of 41st R. *m*; 2nd and 3rd R's*, 1,413.

Surveyors in the North-West, Damage done by.
Reply to Mr. Trudel's Inquiry, 1,035.

Temperance Legislation, Presentation of Petition concerning, 579.

Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' B. (150).
1st R.*, 1,122; 2nd R. *m*, 1,175; In Com., 1,193; 3rd R. *m*, 1,194.

Timber Culling and Measuring Acts Amt. B. (154).
1st R.*, 1,193; 2nd R. *m*, 1,294; In Com., 1,326; 3rd R. *m*, 1,388.

Timber Regulations in British Columbia, Correspondence concerning.
Mr. McInnes' M. for Ret. agreed to, 1,369.

Tracadie Harbor, Improvement of.
Reply to Mr. Haythorne's Inquiry, 518.

Treasury Board Constitution Acts Amt. B. (104).
1st R.* 914; 2nd R. *m*, 914; 3rd R. *m*, 927.

Treaties with Indians in the North-West.
Reply to Mr. Read's Inquiry, 806.

Troops in the North-West, Withdrawal of.
Reply to Mr. Power's Inquiry, 1,055,

Vote of Censure upon Mr. Alexander, for misconduct.
M. withdrawn, 218.

Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. (118).
1st R.*, 931; 2nd R. *m*, 939; In Com., 1,024; 3rd R., 1,025.

Winter Communication with Prince Edward Island.
Reply to Mr. Haythorne's Inquiry, 100; Explanation, &c., 106.

York Station, P. E. Island Railway, Closing of.
Reply to Mr. Haythorne's Inquiry, 521; explanation, 564.

York Station, P. E. Island Railway.
Mr. Haythorne's M. for papers, &c., assented to, 621.

Carvell, Hon. J. S.
Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B. (153).
On 3rd R., 1,382.

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. (92).
In Com., 881; on 3rd R., 981.

Canned Goods B. (U).
3rd R. postponmt. asked for, 988.

General Inspection Act Amt. B. (135).
In Com., 1,121.

Clemow, Hon. Francis.
Introduced, 28.

Dever, Hon. James.
Administration of Justice in the N. W. Territories B. (V).
On 2nd R., 944.

Canned Goods B. (U).
In Com., 936.

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. (92).
In Com., 861, 879; Quest. of order, 881; on 3rd R. 956-59.

Chinese Immigration Restriction and Regulation B. (155).
On 2nd R., 1,298.

Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
On 2nd R., 836.

Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877, Modification B. (20).
Rep. from Com., 1,181.

Divorce Committees, Publication of Evidence before.
Remarks, 328.

Food, Drugs, &c., Adulteration B. (W).
In Com., 1,041.

Industries and Manufactures of Canada.
On Mr. Macdonald's M.; Remarks, 779-80-84.

Railway Subsidies B. (158).
On 2nd R., 1,408.

Sewerage and Ventilation of Senate Building.
Remarks upon, 1,045.

Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. (118).
On 2nd R., 940.

Dickey, Hon. Robert B.
Alberta and Athabasca R.R. Co's B. (73).
Rep. from Com., 685.

Brantford, Waterloo & Lake Erie R.R. Co's B. (59).
Rep. from Com., 408.

Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B. (153).
In Com., 1,360; on 3rd R., 1,384.

Canada Southern & Erie & Niagara R.R. Co's B. (9).
Rep. from Com., 331.

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. (92).
On postponement of 2nd R., 622; on 2nd R., adjournmt. of debate, 684; remarks, 687-696, 731; on pospmt of M. into Com., 791; In Com., 857; on Mr. Almon's amt., 877; on concurr. in amts., 914; on postpmt. of 3rd R., 923; as to insistance upon Senate Amts., 1,162.

Canned Goods B. (U).
On 2nd R., 931.

Cape Traverse Branch Railway.
On Mr. Botsford's M. for Return, 371.

Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
In Com., 905-913; on 3rd R., 929.

Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877, Modification B. (20).
In Com., 1,179.

Cox Divorce B.
On postponement of 2nd R., 406.

Davis Divorce B. (C.)
1st Rep. of Com. (asking forpermission to employ a short-hand writer)

adopted, 104; 2nd Rep. of Com. *m*, 128.
Rep. from Com., 111.

Electoral Franchise B. (103).
On 2nd R., 1,233-1,237; on 3rd R., 1,330.

Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. (6).
On 2nd R., 571.

Explosive Substances B. (K).
In Com., 277.

Fredericton & St. Mary's R.R. Bridge Co's B. (50).
Rep. from Com., 685.

Halifax Volunteers, Transportation of.
Remarks, 562.

Hamilton Provident & Loan Society's B. (J).
On Rep. from Com., 370.

Hatzfeld Divorce B. (D).
On 2nd R., 118; on 1st Rep. of Com., 120.

Huron & Ontario Ship Canal Co's B. (69).
Rep. from Com., 685.

International Coal Co's B. (51).
On 2nd R., 382; Rep. from Com., 407.

Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
Adjournmt. of Deb, *m*, 450; further adjournmt., 598; remarks, 603-12.

Legislation in the Senate, Joint Com. upon.
On Sir A. Campbell's M., 711.

Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. (139).
In Com., 1,169.

Maritime Court of Ontario Jurisdiction B. (11).
In Com., 534.

North-West Territories, Disposal of Lands in.
On Mr. Wark's Inquiry, 850.

Offences Against the Person B. (S).
In Com., 785-90; on concurr. in Amts., 812.

Order, Question of, as to Mr. Alexander's M. *in re* the Upper Canada Bank, 599.

Order, Question of, on Mr. Alexander's Inquiry as to Public Affairs, 818.

Order, Question of, as to Mr. Kaulbach's remarks on 3rd R., of Franchise B., 1,339.

Pawnbroker's B. (R).
In Com., 736; on 3rd R., 738.

Petitions for Private Bills.
As to extension of time for receiving, 51.

Qu'Appelle Diocese Incorp. B. (39).
3rd R. *m*, 465.

Railway, Telegraph and Harbor Com.
Adoption of Reports *m*—1st Rep. (reduction of quorum) 28.

Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
In Com. 257, 270, 273, 275, 354, 360, 361, 364, 373; on Mr. Scott's Amt., 377; Amt. to 91st clause not accepted, 381.

River St. Clair Railway Bridge & Tunnel Co's B. (8).
Rep. from Com., 331.

Rush Lake & Saskatchewan R.R. & Navigation Co's Incorp. B. (70).
Petition presented, 131.
Rep. from Com., 816.

Smith Divorce Bill.
As to selection of com., 55.

Summary Proceedings B. (L).
On 2nd R., 394; In Com., 526.

Tidal Observations, taking of.
Presentation of Petition, 352.

Vote of Censure upon Mr. Alexander.
Remarks, 221.

West Ontario Pacific R.R. Co's Incorp. B. (94)
Rep. from Com., 815.

Winnipeg & Prince Albert R.R. Co's Incorp. B. (91).
Rep. from Com., 815.

Wood Mountain & Qu'Appelle R.R. Co's Incorp. B. (23).
Rep. from Com. with Amt., 465.

Ferrier, Hon. James.

Prince Edward Island, Communication with.
On Mr. Howlan's Inquiry, 509.

Flint, Hon. Billa.

Adjournment (May 8-20)
On Mr. Bellerose's M., 922.

Canada Temperance Act (1878) Amt. B. (92).
On postponemt. of 2nd R., 623; In Com., 868, &c.; on concurr. in amts., 917; on postpmt. of 3rd R., 924; on 3rd R., 946-956.

Chapais, Senator, the late.
Remarks concerning, 1,390.

Death of Senator Benson.
On M. to adjourn, 351.

Divorce Committees, Publication of Evidence before.
Remarks, 330.

Huron & Ontario Ship Canal Co's B. (69).
On 2nd R., 614.

Industries and Manufactures of Canada.
M. for adjournmt. of debate, 480; on Mr Macdonald's M., remarks, 537-44.
Militia Force Land Grant B. (160).
on 3rd R., 1,428.
North-West Rebellion — Correspondence in Relation thereto.
On Mr. Alexander's M. for Return, 1,016
Parliamentary Returns, Number and Expense of.
M. for Return agreed to, 514.
Railway Subsidies B. (164).
On 2nd R., 1,422.
Summary Proceedings B. (L.)
On 2nd R., 404; In Com., 486.
Treaties with Indians in the North-West.
On Mr. Read's Inquiry, 798.

Girard, Hon. Marc Amable.
Address, in Debate on the.
18.
Canned Goods, B. (U).
Rep. from Com., 937.
Crown Account Books, Proof of Entries in B. (M).
Rep. from Com., 412.
Explosive Substances, B. (K).
In Com., 278.
Fort Macleod Ranche Telegraph Co's., Incorp. B. (80).
1st R.*, 932; 2nd R., *m*, 945; Concurr in Amts., *m*, 1046; 3rd R.*, 1046.
General Inspection Act Amt., B. (135).
On 2nd R.*, 1107.
Hudson's Bay route, remarks upon.
19.
Library of Parliament Act Amts., B. (139).
Rep. from Com., 1171
Manitoba and North-West Territories Census, B, (21).
In Committee, 279.
Manitoba and North Western Railway Company's B. (74).
1st R., 650; 2nd R., 686; 3rd R., 841.
Manitoba claims, Final Settlement Bill, (155).
On 2nd R., 1304.
North-West Territories Census B., (21).
On 2nd R., 125.
Railways in the North-West, Suggestions as to better method of Government aid to.
19.
Real Property in the North-West Territories B, (A).
On 2nd R, 191; In Com., 249; 261; 362.
Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Navigation Company's Incorp. B, (70).
1st R., 649; 2nd R. *m*, 686 Concurr., in Amts, and 3rd R, 840.
Sisters of Charity of the North-West Incorp. Act Amendment B. (I).
1st R.*, 131; 2nd R., *m*, 268; 3rd R. 407.
Steamboat Inspection Act Amendment B, (133).
Rep. from Com., 1085.
Winnipeg Bank Incorporation Act Amt. B, (62).
Concurr. in Amts., 640.
Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Co's. Incorp. B., (91).
1st R., 650; 2nd R., 728; Concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R., 816.

Glazier, Hon. John.
Hatzfeld Divorce Bill, (D).
On M. for Adoption of Rep. of Com. 276.

Gowan, Hon. James Robert.
Summoned to the Senate, 3; Introduced, 22.
Bank of Upper Canada.
On Mr. Alexander's Enquiry, M. for Com. Question of Order raised as to Mr. Alexander's remarks 60; Further remarks 63.
Canada Temperance Act (1878. Amt. B, (92).
On 2nd R., 679-80.
Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons B. (26).
In Com., 115.
Divorce Committees, Presence of Strangers at,
Remarks 324.
Electoral Franchise Bill, (103).
On 2nd R.*, 1261-1268; In Com., 1286.
Evans Divorce Bill. (G.)
Reading of Petition *m*, 29; 1st R.*, 49; 2nd R., 112; As to clause providing for custody of child 113; Ref. to Com. 114; 1st Rep. of Com. *m*, 122; Rep. from Com. 198.
Adoption of Rep. of Com. *m*. 280; M. for 3rd R., 280; 3rd R., *m*. 365.
Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. (6).
On 2nd R., 572.
Hatzfeld Divorce Bill. (D).
On 2nd R., 119; On Rep. to Com. 120.
Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Co.
1st R., 554; 2nd R., 613; 3rd R., 685.
Maritime Court of Ontario Jurisdiction Bill. (11).
On 2nd R., 512.

In Com. 532-34.

North-West Territories Census B. (21).
On 2nd R., 127.

Offences against the Person Act Amt. B. (S).
1st R., 663; 2nd R., 725; In Committee 784-90; Concurr. in Amts, *m*, 811; 3rd R. *m*, 822.

Order, Question of.
As to Mr. Alexander's M. *re* Bank of Upper Canada, 602.

Pawnbroker's Bill. (R).
1st R., 663; 2nd R., 723; In Com. 736-38; 3rd R., 738.

Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
On 2nd R., 196; In Com. 247; 255; 262; 267; 273.

Smith Divorce Bill. (B).
1st Rep. of Com., (permission to employ a Stenographer). 111.
Rep. of Com. *m*, 256; Adoption of Rep. *m*, 368.

Summary Proceedings Bill. (L).
1st R.*, 331; 2nd R. *m*, 390; In Com. 481-88; 525-30; 3rd R. *m*, 536.

Winter communication with Prince Edward Island.
On Mr. Haythorne's Inquiry; 99.

Guevremont, Hon. Jean-Baptiste.

Manitoba Lands, copy of Patent issued to Mrs. Lonsdale.
M. for Return; 1046.

Haythorne, Hon. Robert Poore.

Address, in Debate on the.
Remarks, 20.

Absence of Ministers from the Capital.
On Mr. Power's M. for Addresses, 171.

Adjournment—Easter Holidays.
Remarks, 457.

Adjournment (May 8th—20th).
On Mr. Bellerose's M. 921.

Adjournment (June 3rd—10th).
Remarks upon, 1038.

Adjournment (June 20th—July 2nd).
Remarks, 1089.

Administration of Justice in North-West Territories Bill. (V).
In Committee, 1029.
On M. to agree in Amts. of H. of C., 1397.

Agricultural Fertilizers Bill. (122).
On 2nd R., 1084; In Com. 1087.

Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amts. B. (92).
On 2nd R., 715-23; Adj. of Deb. *m*, 723; Remarks continued, 728-31; In Com. 865; 895, On 3rd R.*, 1006-1011; as to insistence upon Senate Amts., 1159.

Cape Traverse Branch Railway.
On Mr. Botsford's M. for Return 372.

Chinese Immigration Restriction and Regulation B. (156).
On 2nd R., 1300; In Com. 1328.

Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
On 2nd R., 837; In Com. 903, 908.

Colonial and Indian Exhibition B. (126).
On 2nd R., 1053.

Commercial depression, causes of.
21.

Committees meeting during adjournment.
Inquiry 51.

Consolidated Insurance Act 1877 Modification Bill. (20).
On 2nd R., 1153.

Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons Bill. (26).
Rep. from Com. 116.

Electoral Franchise Bill. (103).
On 2nd R., 1249-1252; M. to adjourn Debate 1252; Remarks continued 12 3-61; In Com. 1278, 1282; On 3rd R Amt. (exemption of P. E. Island) *m*, 1329, 1339.

Food, Drugs, &c. Adulteration B. (W).
On 2nd R., 944; In Com. 1039.

General Inspection Act Amt. B. (135).
On 2nd R., 1091; In Com. 1107.

Industries and Manufactures of Canada, Report upon.
On Mr. Macdonald's Inquiry, Adjournment of Debate, *m*, 217; Remarks 222-238.

Legislative Work. Increase of, in the Senate.
On Mr. Plumb's M. 633-39; Remarks Concluded 650-53.

Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. (139).
On 2nd R., 1112; In Com. 1170.

Lionel Garnham's Case.
Inquiry 389.

Manitoba Claims Final Settlement Bill. (155).
On 2nd R., 1303.

"Northern Light," Instructions to Commander of.
M. for Return withdrawn 84.

North-West Mounted Police Augmentation Bill. (144).
On 2nd R., 1116.

North-West Rebellion Expenses Bill. (149).
On 2nd R., 1150.

Order, Question of.
On Mr. Alexander's Remarks, 525.
Order, Question of.
As to Mr. Plumb criticising the conduct of members of the H. of C. 1376.
Prince Edward Island, Winter communication with.
22.
Enquiry as to effects of late disaster, 28.
Enquiry as to intentions of Government in reference to. 81-84.
On Mr. Howlan's Inquiry 504-06.
Privilege, Question of.
In reference to M. for adjournment 466.
Prohibitory Liquor Law, Petition for, presented.
616.
Provincial Rights.
Remarks upon, 21.
Question of order raised on Mr. Kaulbach's remarks.
420.
Railway Subsidies Bill. (164).
On 2nd R., 1423.
Real Property in the North-West Territories Bill. (A).
On 2nd R., 203.
Rebellion in the North-West, Proclamation to rebels.
Inquiry 723.
Tracadie Harbor, Improvement of.
Inquiry 517.
Washington Treaty, Fishery Clauses of.
21.
Weights and Measures Acts Amt. Bill. (118).
On 2nd R., 942.
Winter Communication with Prince Edward Island.
Enquiry 85, 102; Further Remarks 107.
York Station, P. E. Island Railway, closing of.
Inquiry 519; On Sir Alex. Campbell's Explanation 564.
York Station, P. E. Island Railway; Correspondence &c. in regard thereto.
M. for Return 619.

Howlan, Hon. George W.

Canned Goods Bill. (U).
In Com. 934.
Contingency Com.
Adoption of Reports *m*, 1st Rep. (reduction of quorum) 29; 2nd Rep. (expenditure &c.) 1413.
Electoral Franchise Bill. (103).
On 3rd R., 1332.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. (135)
In Com. 1097-1105; do 1119-21.
Industries and Manufactures of Canada, Report upon.
On Mr. Macdonald's Inquiry. Adjournment of Debate *m*, 238; Remarks 280-289.
Maritime Court of Ontario Jurisdiction Bill. (11).
In Com. 533.
North-West Territories, Disposal of Lands in.
On Mr. Wark's Inquiry 845.
Prince Edward Island, Communication with.
Inquiry and Remarks 489-504.
Order, Question of.
As to Mr. Alexander's M. in *re* Upper Canada Bank. 602.
Real Property in the North-West Territories Bill. (A).
On 2nd R., 194.
Weights and Measures Acts Amt. Bill. (118).
On 2nd R., 941.
Winter Communication with Prince Edward Island.
On Mr Haythorne's Inquiry 91; Further Remarks 107.

Kaulbach, Hon. Henry A. N.

Absence of Ministers from the Capital.
On Mr. Power's M. for address. 172.
Adjournment. Easter Holidays.
Remarks, 456.
Adjournment (May 8th—20th).
On Mr. Bellerose's M., and Mr. Wark's Amt. thereto 919,
Adjournment (June 3rd—10th).
Remarks upon 1039.
Advances to the Provinces B. (7).
In Com. 615.
Canadian Pacific Railway Terminus in British Columbia.
On Mr. McInnes' M. for Return 1137.
Canadian Pacific Railway Completion Bill. (153).
In Com. 1345; 1353; on 3rd R., 1380-82.
Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
In Com. 858; On concurr. in Amts. 916; On adj. of Deb. 987; on 3rd R., 1001-1005.
Canned Goods Bill. (U).
On 2nd R., 931; In Com. 936.
Chinese Immigration Restriction and Regulation Bill. (155).
On 2nd R., 1296; In Com. 1328.

Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
In Com. 903; On 3rd R., 930.

Consolidated Militia Act Amt. B. (152).
On 3rd R., 1289.

Cox Divorce Bill.
As to relaxing rules in reference to notice. 50.
Proof of Service &c. 664.

Divorce Committees, Publication of Evidence before.
Remarks 328.

Davis Divorce Bill (C).
Amendment of M, in reference to exam. of petitioner. 57.
Asks to be excused from serving on Com. 104; On Rep. of Com. 128; On 3rd R. 156.

Evans Divorce Bill. (G).
On M. for 3rd R. 365.

Electoral Franchise Bill. (103).
On 2nd R., 1244-1249; On 3rd R., 1339.

Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. Bill. (6).
On 2nd R., 567.

General Inspection Act Amt. B. (135).
On 2nd R., 1091; In Com. 1097-1106.

Half-Breed Claims in the North-West.
On Mr. Trudel's M. for Return 648.

Halifax Volunteers, Transportation of.
On Mr. Power's Inquiry, 535.

Halifax Volunteers, Transportation of.
Remarks, 562.

Hatzfeld Divorce Bill (D).
Reading of Petition, *m*, 32; 1st R.*, 34; As to Service of Notice, &c., 116; 2nd R. *m*, 117; Ref. to Com., 120; 1st Rep. of Com., 120; Rep. from Com., 198.
Adoption of Rep. of Com. *m*, 276; 3rd R. *m*, 368.

Industries and Manufactures of Canada, Report upon.
On Mr. Macdonald's Inquiry; Remarks, 300-302; Adjournmt. of Debate *m*, 302; Remarks concluded, 383; Further remarks, 412-427; Continued, 461-465.

Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
On Mr. Plumb's M., 449.

Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. (139).
In Com., 1170.

Liquor License Act 1883 B. (134).
On 2nd R., 1173.

Manitoba Claims Final Settlement B. (155).
On 2nd R, 1303.

Maritime Court of Ontario Jurisdiction B. (11).
On 2nd R., 512.
In Com. 531-34.

Militia Force Land Grant B. (160).
On 3rd R. 1427.

North-West, Disposal of Lands in.
On Mr. Wark's Inquiry, 847.

North-West Rebellion, Vote of thanks to Gen. Middleton, the Militia, &c.
Remarks, 1395.

North-West Territories Census B. (21).
On 2nd R., 127.

North-West Rebellion, Correspondence in relation to.
On Mr. Alexander's M. for Return, 1020.

Offences against the Person Act Amt. B. (S).
On 2nd R., 726.

Offences against the Person B. (S).
In Com., 786; On Concurr. in Amts., 811; On 3rd R., 824.

Order, Question of, raised.
As to Mr. Bellerose's remarks, 560.

Order, Question of.
On Mr. Alexander reading his speech, 1013.

Pawnbrokers' B. (R).
In Com., 738.

Prince Edward Island, Winter Communication with.
On Mr. Haythorne's Inquiry, 82.
On Mr. Haythorne's Inquiry, 97.
On Mr. Howlan's Inquiry, 506.

Prisoners' Employment B. (87).
On 2nd R., 931.

Public Loan B. (145).
On 3rd R., 1072.

Railway Loan Subsidies B. (147).
In Com., 1177.

Railway Subsidies B (158).
On 3rd R., 1417.

Railway Subsidies B. (164).
On 3rd R, 1425.

Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
On 2nd R., 192; In Com., 244, 247, 254, 261, 264, 265, 272, 356, 359; On Mr. Scott's Amts., 375.

Sable Island, Live saving Service at.
On Mr. Almon's M., 642.

Sewerage and Ventilation of Senate Building.
Remarks upon, 1045.

Short Line Railway,
Remarks on Mr. Power's M. for address for Reports of Surveys, &c., 348.

Short Line Railway, Petition for a Survey, &c.
On Mr. Power's M. for Return, 1189.
Smith Divorce Bill (B).
As to selection of Com., 54.
On M. for adoption of Rep. of Com., 368.
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Investigation.
On Mr. Bellerose's M. for Return, 561.
Summary Proceedings B. (L).
On 2nd R., 403.
In Com., 482-86, 529.

Lacoste, Hon. Alexander.
Canada Congregational Missionary Socy's B. (54).
Rep. from Com., 408.
Canada Co-operative Assn. B. (81).
Rep. from Com., 599.
Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada Synod Incorp. B. (60).
Rep. from Com., 705.
Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
In Com., 244, 255.
Standing Orders Com.
Adoption of Reports *m*.
2nd Rep. (extension of time for receiving petitions for Private Bills) *m*, 31.
4th Rep. (compliance with rules), 34.
5th Rep. (extension of time), 34.
8th Rep. (extension of time), 79.
12th Rep. (extension of time), 239.
Summary Proceedings B. (L).
In Com., 482-87.

Lewin, Hon. James D.
Industries and Manufactures of Canada.
Remarks, 477-80.

McClelan, Hon. Abner Reid.
Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
On Postpmt. of 3rd R., 925.
Evangelical Lutheran Church Synod Incorp. B. (60).
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 530.
Industries and Manufactures of Canada.
On Mr. Macdonald's M.; Remarks, 545, 554; Debate adjourned, M., 639; Further adjourned, 663; Remarks concluded, 738-79.
Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
Adjournment of Debate, M, 612; Remarks, 623-30.
North-West Territories, Disposal of Lands in.
On Mr. Wark's Inquiry, 850.
Simpson, Hon. Mr., Death of.
Remarks upon, 428.
Summary Proceedings B. (L).
Rep. from Com., 529.
Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
On Mr. Scott's Amt., 379.

Macdonald, Hon. William John (B. C.)
Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.
Motion, 5.
Absence of Ministers from the Capital.
On Mr. Power's M. for Address; Question of Order raised on Mr. Power's remarks, 167; and on Mr. Alexander's remarks, 171; See also 173.
Administration of Justice in the North-West Territories B. (V).
In Com., 1027.
Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
In Com., 856.
Canadian Pacific Railway Terminus in British Columbia.
On Mr. McInnes' M. for Return, 1142.
Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B. (153).
In Com., 1364.
Chinese Immigration Restriction and Regulation B. (155).
On 2nd R., 1,296, 1,298; In Com., 1,327.
Electoral Franchise B. (103).
In Com., 1,276-83.
Industries and Manufactures of Canada, Report upon.
Enquiry and remarks, 131-141.
Further remarks, 780-84.
Treaties with Indians in the North-West.
On Mr. Read's Inquiry, 809; called to order, 809.
Sewerage and Ventilation of Senate Building.
Remarks upon, 1,045.

McDonald, Hon. William (C. B.)
Summoned to the Senate and introduced, 3.
Adjournment (May 8-20).
On Mr. Bellerose's M., 919.
International Coal Co's B. (51).
Concurr. in Amts. of Com., *m*, 408.

Macfarlane, Hon. Alexander.
Bridge, Boom, &c., Act Amt. B. (101).
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 536; 3rd R., 598.

Manitoba and North-West Territories Census B. (21).
Rep. from Com., 280.
Winter Communication with Prince Edward Island.
On Mr. Haythorne's Inquiry, 90.

MacInnes, Hon. Donald.
Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31)
On 2nd R., 827.

McInnes, Hon. Thomas R. (B. C.)
Adjournment (June 20-July 2)
M. agreed to, 1,088.
British Columbia Bank B. (105).
On 2nd R., 1,055.
Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
In Com., 855; on adjournmt of deb., 987.
Canadian Pacific Railway Terminus in British Columbia.
M. for Return, 1,123.
Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B. (153).
In Com., Amt. (as to terminus at Pt Moody) *m*, 1,345-52; on 3rd R., Amt. (terminus to be fixed at Pt Moody) *m*, 1,385; lost on div., 1,386; Amt. (no change of terminus for 10 years) lost on div., 1,387.
Canned Goods B. (U).
On 2nd R., 930.
Electoral Franchise B. (103).
In Com., 1,279; on 3rd R., 1,336.
Port Moody Engine House, Building of.
Inquiry, 1,047.
Representation of the Provinces and Territories in the Privy Council.
Motion withdrawn, 1,388.
Sewerage and Ventilation of Senate Building.
Remarks upon, 1,045.
Timber Regulations in British Columbia, Correspondence concerning.
M. for Return, 1,369.
Weights & Measures Acts Amt. B. (118).
On 2nd R., 940.

Macpherson, Hon. Sir David Lewis.
Bank of Upper Canada, Debt due Government by.
On Mr. Alexander's Inquiry, 39.
On Mr. Alexander's M. for Com., 66.
Debates of the Senate Committee, Appointment of, *m*, 24.
Half-breed Claims in the North-west.
Mr. Trudel's M, for Return assented to, 644.
Industries and Manufactures of Canada, Report upon.
On Mr. Macdonald's Inquiry, Adjournmt. of debate *m*, 154; remarks, 209-217.
North-West Rebellion, Correspondence in Relation to.
Mr. Alexander's M. for Return agreed to, 1,022.
North-West Troubles, Half-breed claims,
Mr. Alexander's M. for Return agreed to, 525.
Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
Adjournment of debate on 2nd R. *m*, 178; remarks on 2nd R., 179-182.
Select Standing Committees, Appointment of, *m*, 23.

McKay, Hon. Thomas.
Albion Mines Savings Bank B. (157).
1st R.*, 382; 2nd R. *m*, 411; 3rd R.* 535.

McMaster, Hon. William.
Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. (92).
Rep. from Com., 898.
Evans Divorce Bill, Conduct of, transferred to Hon. Mr. Gowan, 29.
Great Western & Lake Ontario Shore Junction R.R. Co's Amt. B. (38).
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R. *m*, 369; 3rd R., 407.

McMillan, Hon. Donald.
Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. (92).
In Com., 859; on 3rd R. Amt. *m*, 972-74.
Temperance Act Petitions, Forgery of Signatures to.
As to McDougald's declaration, 989; matter brought up again, 1,036.

Montgomery, Hon. Donald.
Electoral Franchise B. (103).
On 3rd R., 1,334.

Nelson, Hon. Hugh.
Adjournment (June 3-22).
M. not agreed to, 1,038.
Agricultural Fertilizers B. (122).
Rep. from Com., 1,087.

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. (92).
In Com., 855; on 3rd R., Amt. *m*, 975.
Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B. (153).
In Com., 1,361.
Chinese Immigration Restriction and Regulation B. (155).
In Com., 1,326.
Electoral Eranchise B. (103).
In Com., 1,277-83.
Infectious or Contagious Diseases of Animals B. (34).
Rep. from Com. 840.

O'DONOHOE, Hon. JOHN.

Adjournment—Easter Holidays, 457.
Adjournment (May 8-20).
On Mr. Bellerose's M., 921.
Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B. (153).
Rep. from. Com., 1,369.
Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. (92).
On 3rd R., 983-86; on postpmt of consid. of Commons Amts., 1,096.
Divorce Committees, Publication of Evidence before.
Remarks, 327.
Electoral Franchise B. (103).
On 3rd R., 1,338.
Offences against the Person B. (S).
On Concurr. in Amts., 811.
Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (H).
On 2nd R., 200; In Com., 263, 359.
Summary Proceedings B. (L).
On 2nd R., Amt. (six months, hoist) not agreed to, 398, 405.
West Ontario Pacific R. R. Co's Incorp. B. (94).
2nd R., 736.

ODELL, Hon. WILLIAM HUNTER.

Advances to the Provinces B. (7).
Rep. from Com., 616.
Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
In Com., 868, 891.
Central Bank of New Brunswick B. (40).
Concurr. in Amt., M., 640.
Divorce Committees, Presence of Strangers at.
Remarks on, 323.
Preservation of the Peace near Public Works B. (O).
Rep. from Com., 623.
Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
On 2nd R., 182.
Terry Divorce B. (E).
1st R. of Com. (permission to employ short-hand writer), 111; Rep. from Com., 382; Adoption of R. *m*, 276.

OGILVIE, Hon. ALEXANDER W.

Adjournment (June 20th—July 2nd).
Remarks, 1088.
Banque du Peuple B. (53).
On 3rd R., 586.
Canned Goods B. (U).
In Com., 934.
Consolidated Insurance Act 1877 Modification B. (20).
In Com., 1181.
Consolidated Militia Act 1883 Amt. B. (152).
On 2nd R., 1273.
Cox Divorce B. (H).
Reading of Petition; M. withdrawn, 25 M. renewed and agreed to, 31; M. as to dispensing with 72nd Rule postponed, 34; Ref. back to Com. 49; 2nd R. postponed, 405; Further postponement, 513.
Davis Divorce Bill (C).
Reading of Petition *m*, 26; 1st R.*, and M. for 2nd R., 29; 2nd R. postponed, *m*, 56.
Halifax Volunteers, Transportation of.
On Mr. Power's Inquiry, 536.
International Coal Co's B. (51).
1st R.*, 350, M. for 2nd R., 352.
Prince Edward Island, Communication with.
On Mr. Howlan's Inquiry, 508.
North-West Territories Census B. (21).
On 2nd R., 125.
Summary Proceedings B. (L).
In Com., 487.
Treaties with the Indians in the North-West.
On Mr. Read's Inquiry, 797.

PAQUET, Hon. ANSELM HOMÈRE.

Banque du Peuple B. (53).
1st R.*, 429; 2nd R. *m*, 466; 3rd R. *m*, 579.
Electoral Franchise B. (103).
On 2nd R., 1268-1270.
Food, Drugs, &c., Adulteration B. (W).
In Com., 1043.

PELLETIER, Hon. C. A. P.

France and Canada, Steam Communication between.
Inquiry, 664.

Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co's. B. (61).
2nd R. *m*, 810; 3rd R., 841.
Timber Culling and Measuring Acts and Amts. B. (154).
In Com., 1326.
Vote of Censure upon Mr. Alexander.
Remarks, 221.

Plumb, Hon. J. B.
Adjournment, Easter Holidays.
Remarks, 457.
Absence of Ministers from the Capital.
On Mr. Power's M. for Address, 167.
Adjournment (June 3rd—10th).
Remarks upon, 1038.
Adjournment (June 20th—July 2nd).
Remarks, 1088.
Banking and Commerce Com.
Adoption of Reports *m*; 1st Rep. (reduction of quorum), 29.
Bank of Upper Canada Debt due Government by.
On Mr. Alexander's Inquiry, 44.
On Mr. Alexander's M. for Com., 66.
Banque du Peuple B. (53).
On 3rd R., 581.
Brantford, Waterloo, and Lake Erie, R. R. Co's Incorp. B. (59).
1st R.*, 350; 2nd R. *m*, 382; Concurr. in Amts. of Com. postponed, 408; 3rd R. *m*, 466.
Canada Southern and Erie & Niagara R. R. Co's B. (9).
1st R.*, 130; 2nd R. *m*, 178; 3rd R. *m*. 331.
Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
On 2nd R., 680-84; In Com., 866, &c, 884; On Postpmt. of 3rd R., 926; On adjournment of Deb. 986; As to Insistence upon Senate Amts. 1165.
Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B. (153).
In Com. 1367; On 3rd R., 1370-76.
Chinese Immigration Restriction and Regulation B. (155).
In Com., 1327.
Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
In Com, 906,
Consolidated Insurance Act 1877 Modification B. (20).
In Com., 1180.
Davis Divorce B. (C).
As to exclusion of persons from Com. room, 156.
Death of Senator Benson.
On M. to adjourn, 351.
Divorce Committees, Publication of Evidence before.
Remarks, 325.
Dominion Drainage Co's Incorp. B. (28).
1st R.*, 1143; 2nd R. *m*, 1192; 3rd R. *m*, 1193.
Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Ins. Assn. B. (55).
1st R., 650; 2nd R. *m*, 686; Concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R., 841.
Electoral Franchise B. (103).
On 2nd R, 1216-1230; In Com., 1278; On 3rd R., 1335.
Evans Divorce B. (G).
On M. for 3rd R., 366.
Federal Bank of Canada B. (10).
Rep. from Com. and M. for 3rd R., 350.
Fort Macleod Ranche Telegraph Co's Incorp. B. (80).
Rep. from Com., 1046.
Hamilton, Guelph & Buffalo R. R. Co. Incorp. B. (77).
1st R.*, 554; 2nd R., 612; 3rd R., 684.
Hamilton Provident & Loan Society's B. (J).
Rep. from Com., 370.
Hatzfeld Divorce B. (D).
On 2nd R., 119; On 1st Rep. of Com., 122.
Huron & Ontario Ship Canal Co's B. (69).
On 2nd R., 614.
Industries and Manufactures of Canada, Report upon.
On Mr. Macdonald's Inquiry, 145, 146, 784.
Lake Erie, Essex & Detroit River R. R. Co's Incorp. B. (24).
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R. *m**, 411; 3rd R., 465.
Legislation in the Senate, Joint Com. upon.
On Sir Alex. Campbell's M., 706.
Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
M. postponed, 80; Further postponement, 179; M. and remarks, 429-444; Further remarks, 659-662.
Library, Joint Com. upon.
1st Rep. (publication of Mr. Todd's work) adoption, *m*, 1398.
Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. (139).
On M. for 2nd R., 1095.
Liquor Traffic, Amount of Revenue from in 1884.
M. for Return agreed to, 109.

London Life Ins. Co's Act Amt. B. (76).
2nd R. *m*, 988; 3rd R., 1012.

North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. (144).
On 2nd R., 1118.

North-West Rebellion, Correspondence in relation thereto.
Quest. of Order on Mr. Alexander's Speech, 1013.

North-West Territories Census B. (21).
On 2nd R., 123.

North-West Territories, Disposal of Lands in.
On Mr. Wark's Inquiry, 848.

Ontario & Pacific R. R. Co's B. (72).
1st R., 554; 2nd R., 598; 3rd R., 684.

Order, Question of, raised as to relevancy of Mr. Bellerose's remarks on Franchise Bill.
1214.

Order, Question of, as to Mr. Power attributing motives to members of the House of Commons.
1403.

Parliamentary Returns, Number and Expense of.
On Mr. Flint's M. for Return, 515.

Privilege, Question of, as to accuracy of Mr. Power's statement.
1083.

Public Loan B. (145).
On 3rd R., 1074,

Qu'Appelle Diocese Incorp. B. (39).
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R. *m*, 411.

Question of Order raised as to Mr. Alexander's remarks on M. to adjourn.
455.

Railway Subsidies B. (164).
On 3rd R., 1425.

Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A),
On 2nd R., 182; In Com., 256, 265, 270, 352; On Mr. Scott's Amts., 375.

Sewerage and Ventilation of Senate Building.
Remarks upon, 1045.

Short Line Railway, Petitions for a Survey, &c.
On Mr. Power's M. for Return, 1191.

Smith Divorce Bill.
Inaccuracy pointed out in papers, 53.

South Saskatchewan Valley R. R. Co's Incorp B. (37).
1st R.*, 405; 2nd R. *m*, 411; 3rd R, 465.

Standing Orders and Private Bills Com.
Adoption of 14th Rep. *m*, 332.

St. Claire Bridge and Tunnel Co's B. (8).
1st R.*, 111; 2nd R. *m*, 127; 3rd R. *m* 331.

Summary Proceedings B. (L).
In Com., 482-86.

West Ontario Pacific R. R.Co's Incorp. B. (94).
1st R., 711; Consideration of Amts. *m*, 815; 3rd R. *m*, 840.

Wood Mountain & QuAppelle R. R. Co's Incorporation B. (23).
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R. *m*, 369; 3rd R. *m*, 465.

Poirier, Hon. Pascal.

Summoned to the Senate, 239; Introduced, 269.

Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
On 2nd R., 839.

Consolidated Insurance Act 1877 Modification B. (20).
In Com., 1178.

Electoral Franchise B. (103).
On 2nd R., 1270-1272.

North-West Rebellion, Vote of thanks to Gen. Middleton, the Militia &c.
Remarks, 1396.

On 10th Rep. of Printing Com.
Remarks, 1398.

Power, Hon. Lawrence Geoffrey.

Absence of Ministers from the Capital.
M. for Address, 159-168; Withdrawn, 173.

Adjournment, Easter holidays.
Remarks, 454.

Adjournment suggested.
Remarks, 822.

Adjournment (Queen' Birthday).
On Sir Alex. Campbell's M. 945.

Adjournment (June 3rd—10th).
Remarks upon, 1039.

Administration of Justice in the North West Territories B. (V).
On 2nd R., 944; In Com., 1028.

Advances to the Provinces B. (7).
In Com., 615.

Agricultural Fertilizers B. (122).
In Com., 1087.

Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
On 2nd R., 733; On Postpmt. of M. into

Com., 791; Amt. proposed on going into Com., 852; In Com. Quest. of Order, 881; On 3rd R. Amt. *m*, 960-67, 975, 1011; On Postpmt. of consideration of. Senate Amts., 1096.

Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B. (153).
On 2nd R., 1318-26; In Com., 1344-1365; On 3rd R., 1376-1380; Amt. (as to extension to English Bay) *m*, 1379; Amt. withdrawn, 1385; Amt. (as to terminus in B. C.) lost on div., 1387.

Canadian Pacific Railway Terminus in British Columbia.
On Mr. McInnes' M. for Return, 1140.

Canned Goods B. (U).
In Com., 933.

Chinese Commission, Expenses of.
M. for Return granted, 459.

Chinese Immigration Restriction and Regulation B. (155).
On 2nd R., 1297; In Com., 1327.

Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
On 2nd R., 831; In Com., 901; Amt. *m*, 904, 907, 908-13.

Codification of the Criminal Law.
Inquiry as to intention of Govt., 48.

Colonial and Indian Exhibition B. (126).
On 2nd R. 1053; Rep. from Com., 1086.

Commercial Bank of Windsor B. (117).
On 2nd R. 1052.

Consolidated Insurance Act 1877 Modification B. (20).
In Com., 1177.

Consolidated Militia Act 1883 Am. B. (152).
On 2nd R., 1273; On 3rd R., 1289.

Consolidated Railway Act 1879 Amt. B. (Q).
In Com., 733.

Contingency Com. 2nd Rep.
On M. for adoption, 1,414.

Crown Accounts Books, Proof of Entries in, B. (M).
On Consideration of Commons Amt., 1047.

Davis Divorce Bill.
As to M. for postponement of 2nd R., 57.

Debates of the Senate, Circulation of. 25.

Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons B. (26).
On 2nd R., 114; In Com., 115.

Divorce Committees, Presence of Strangers at, and Publication of Evidence.
Remarks 324.

Electoral Franchise B. (103).
On 2nd R., 1237-1244; In Com., 1280-87; On 3rd R. Amt. (definition of "person") *m*, 1342.

Evans Divorce B. (G).
On M. for 3rd R., 360.

Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. (6).
1st R.*, 382; 2nd R. *m*, 565, 577.

Explosive Substances B. (K).
In Com., 276, 278.

Food, Drugs, &c., Adulteration B. (W).
On 2nd R., 945; in Com., 1,039, &c.; on concurr. in Commons, Amts., 1,118.

General Inspection Act Amt. B. (135).
On 2nd R., 1,091; in Com., 1,097-1,107; 1,119-1,121.

Half-breed Claims in the North-West.
On Mr. Trudel's M. for Return, 646.

Half-breed Grievances in the North-West, Correspondence in Relation to.
On Mr. Alexander's M. for Ret., 1,032.

Halifax Harbor Master's Act Amt. B. (148).
On 2nd R., 1,108; in com., 1,167; on 3rd R., 1,168.

Halifax Volunteers, Transportation of.
Inquiry, 535; explanation, 603.

Hatzfeld Divorce B. (D).
As to sufficiency of service, 32; on 1st Rep. of Com., 120.

Huron & Ontario Ship Canal Co's B. (69).
On 2nd R., 613.

Industries and Manufactures of Canada, Report upon.
On Mr. Macdonald's Inquiry, remarks, 291-300.

Infectious or Contagious Diseases of Animals B. (34)
In Com., 839.

Insolvent Banks' and Corporations' Act Amt. B. (W).
On 2nd R., 488.
In Com., 530.

International Coal Co's B. (51).
2nd R. *m*, 382.

Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
As to regularity of Mr. Plumb's notice, 80.

Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
On Mr. Plumb's M. 448; further remarks, 633.

Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. (139).
On M. for 2nd R., 1,095; on 2nd R., 1,108; in Com., 1,169.

Liquor License Act, 1883, B. (134).
On 2nd R., 1,174.

Manitoba and North-West Territories Census B. (21).
In Com., 279.

Manitoba Claims Final Settlement B. (155).
On 2nd R., 1,302.

Maritime Court of Ontario Jurisdiction B. (11).
On 3rd R., 565.

Militia Force Land Grant B. (160).
On 3rd R., 1,429.

North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. (144).
On 2nd R., 1,115.

North-West Rebellion, Correspondence in Relation thereto.
On Mr. Alexander's M. for Return, 1,017.

North-West Rebellion—Vote of Thanks to General Middleton, the Militia, &c.
Remarks, 1,396.

North-West Territories Census B. (21).
On 2nd R., 123.

North-West Territories, Disposal of Lands in.
On Mr. Wark's Inquiry, 847.

Offences Against the Person Act Amt. B. (S).
On 2nd R., 727.
In Com., 788; on concurr. in Amts., 811.

Order, Question of, Raised as to Mr. Plumb's Remarks, 456.

Order, Question of, as to Mr. Alexander's M. *in re* Bank of Upper Canada, 601.

Order, Question of, on Mr. Alexander's Inquiry as to the Public Affairs, 818.

Order, Question of, on Mr. Alexander Reading his Speech, 1,014.

Order, Question of, as to Mr. Plumb asserting that Mr. Power had no authority for a certain Statement in Reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, 1,375.

Pawnbrokers B. (R).
On Ref. to Com. of W., 725; In Com., 737; on 3rd R., 738.

Preservation of Peace near Public Works. B. (O).
In Com., 623.

Prince Edward Island, Communication with.
On Mr. Howlan's Inquiry, 510.

Privilege, Question of, as to expunging Mr. Alexander's Speech from the Reports, 240.

Privilege, Question of.
Accuracy of statement established, 1,083.

Public Loan B. (145).
On 2nd R., 1,050; on 3rd R., 1,067.

Railway Land Subsidies B. (147).
In Com., 1,177.

Railway Subsidies B. (158).
On 2nd R., 1,398; In Com., 1,415; Amt. (to 1st clause) lost on a div., 1,415; on 3rd R., same Amt. ruled out of order, 1,417; another Amt. ruled out of order, 1,420.

Railway Subsidies B. (164).
On 2nd R., 1,423; on 3rd R., 1,424.

Railway Survey Reports, Bringing down of.
Inquiry, 822.

Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
On 2nd R., 188; in Com., 251, 255, suggested Amt. to 12th clause accepted, 257-8, 263, 266, 267, 268, 269, 272, 274, 356, 358, 363, 374; on Mr. Scott's Amts., 376; Amt. to 11th and 12th clauses not accepted, 381.

Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Co. B. (52).
1st R*., 302; 2nd R. *m*, 368; 3rd R., 407.

Secretary of State Department Amendment B. (102).
On 2nd R., 536.

Sewerage and Ventilation of Senate Building.
Remarks upon, 1,044.

Short Line Railway.—M. for address for copies of reports of surveys, &c.
Remarks, 332-344; 348-350.

Short Line Railway, Petitions for a survey, &c.
M. for Return, 1,182.

Short Line Railway, Route provided for.
Inquiry, 1,143.

Smith Divorce Bill.
As to examn. of witness, 53; as to selection of com., 54.

Standing Orders Com., On 8th Rep. of, 79.

Summary Proceedings B. (L).
On 2nd R., 399; in Com., 481-87, 529.

Temperance Legislation, Presentation of Petition Concerning.
Remarks, 579.

Treaties with Indians in the North-West.
On Mr. Read's Inquiry, 802.

Troops in the North-West, Withdrawal of.
Inquiry, 1055.

Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. (118).
On 2nd R., 940; In Com., 1024.

Winter Communication with Prince Edward Island.
On Mr. Haythorne's Inquiry, 94.

READ, Hon. ROBERT.

Adjournment, Easter Holidays.
Remarks, 457.

Adjournment (May 8th—20th).
On Mr. Bellerose M., 922.

Adjournment (June 3rd—10th).
Remarks upon, 1038.

Consolidated Militia Act Amt. B. (152).
On 3rd R., 1288.

Cox Divorce B. (H).
1st R. and M. for 2nd R., 106; Proof of Service &c., 664; 2nd R. *m*, 665; Adoption of Rep. of Com. *m*, 735; 3rd R. *m*, 736.

Davis Divorce B. (C).
2nd R. *m*, 103; Ref. to Com., *m*, 103.
3rd R. *m*, 155; Communication of evidence to House of Commons, *m*, 156.

Divorce Committees, Publication of Evidence before.
Remarks, 326.

Dominion Drainage Co's. Incorp. B. (28).
Rep. from Com., 1193.

Electoral Franchise B. (103).
Rep. from Com., 1287.

Halifax Volunteers, Transportation of.
Remarks, 563.

Industries and Manufactures of Canada.
M. to adjourn Debate, 465; Remarks, 467-74.

North-West Rebellion, Correspondence in relation to.
Remarks, 1021.

Parliamentary Returns, Number and Expense of.
On Mr. Flint's M. for Return, 515.

Printing Committee.
Adoption of Reports *m*; 1st Rep. (reduction of quorum), 31; 2nd Rep. adoption postponed, 49; 2nd Rep. adopted, 104; 3rd and 4th Rep. *m*, 130.
3rd Rep., (Documents to be printed), 368; 6th Rep., (Increase of Salary), 612; 7th Rep., (Documents printed), 1024; 8th Rep. Consideration postponed, 1253.

Printing Committee &c.
9th Rep. (Documents printed &c.), 1292; 10th Rep. (Appointmt. of Officials &c.), 1397.

Qu'Appelle Diocese Incorp. B. (39).
Rep. from Com., 465.

Railway Subsidies B. (158).
Rep. from Com., 1417.

Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
Rep. from Com., 374.

Smith Divorce Bill (B).
Reading of Petition *m*, 27; 1st R.*, and Motion for 2nd R., 29; Exam. of Witness and 2nd R. *m*, 52; Ref. to a Select Com. *m*, 54; Reported against by Com., 256; Rep. of Com. adopted, 368; Refund of Fees *m*, 1275.

Standing Orders and Private Bills Com.
Adoption of Reports *m*; 1st Rep. (reduction of quorum), 28; 2nd Rep., (extension of time), 28; 3rd Rep., (compliance with rules), 28; 9th Rep. (Suspension of 59th Rule), 157; 10th Rep. (Suspension of 51st Rule), 157; 13th, 14th and 15th Reps. *m*, 332.

Terry Divorce Bill.
Reading of petition *m*, 30; 1st R.*, 34; 2nd R. *m*, 110; ref. to Select Com., *m* 111; 3rd R. *m*, 331.

Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners B. (150).
Rep. from Com, 1,193.

Treaties with the Indians in the North-West.
Inquiry, 791.

Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. (118).
On 2nd R., 942; Rep. from Com., 1,025.

ROBITAILLE, Hon. THEODORE.

Summoned to the Senate and introduced, 3.

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, &c., Amt. B. (92).
As to insistence upon Senate Amts. rejected by Commons, 1158.

Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
On Mr. Plumb's Motion, 630-32-33.

Reesor, Hon. David.

Evangelical Lutheran Church Synod Incorp. B. (60).
3rd R. *m*, 705.

South-Western Railway, Construction of Inquiry, 409.

Ryan, Hon. Thomas.

Bank of Montreal Annuity and Guarantee Funds Society B. (48).
1st R.*, 429; 2nd R. *m*, 522; 3rd R.*, 535.

Bank of Montreal Pension Fund Society B. (49).
1st R.*, 429; 2nd R. *m*, 522; 3rd R.*, 535.

Canada Co-operative Assoc'n B. (81).
1st R.*, 429; 2nd R. *m*, 522; 3rd R., 599.

Maritime Court of Ontario Jurisdiction B. (11).
In Com., 532.

Royal Canadian Ins. Co's B. (48).
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 522; 3rd R.* *m*, 587.

Schultz, Hon. John.

Hudson's Bay, Exports from.
Motion for Return agreed to, 199.

Hydrographic Surveys of Lakes in the North-West.
Inquiry, 48.

Indians in the North-West, Correspondence Concerning.
Motion for Return, 587.

North-West, Representation of the, in the Cabinet.
Inquiry, 157.

North-West Territories, Superintendents of Education in the.
Inquiry, 199

Red River, Dredging the Mouth of.
Inquiry, 256.

Scott, Hon. Richard William.

Address, in debate on the,
Remarks, 13.

Administration of Justice in the North-West Territories B. (V).
On 2nd R., 943.

Bank of Upper Canada.
On Mr. Alexander's Motion for Com., 69.

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. (92).
On 2nd R., 696-705: in Com., 859, &c.; on 3rd R., 974; adjournmt of Deb. *m*, 986; remarks, 990-1001.
As to insistence upon Senate Amts., 1157, &c.

Canadian Pacific Railway Employees Relief Ass'n (75).
1st R., 554; 2nd R. *m*, 613; 3rd R., *m*, 640.

Canned Goods B. (U).
In Com., 933.

Chapais, Senator, the late.
Remarks concerning 1389.

Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
On 2nd R., 834.

Colonial and Indian Exhibition B. (126.)
On 2nd R., 1052.

Cox Divorce Bill.
As to dispensing with rules, 34.

Death of Senator Benson.
On Motion to adjourn, 351.

Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons B. (26).
In Com., 114.

Electoral Franchise B. (103).
On 2nd R., 1200-1206; Amt. moved (six months' hoist), 1206; In Com., 1276-87; On 3rd R., Amt. (to 9th section) *m*, 1341.

Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt B. (6).
On 2nd R., 575.

Half-breed Grievances in the North-West, Correspondence in relation to.
On Mr. Alexander's Motion for Return, 1032.

Half-breed Troubles in the North-West.
Inquiry, 410.

Industries and Manufactures of Canada, Report upon.
On Mr. Macdonald's Inquiry, 141-154.

Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co's, and other Corporations Act Amt. B. (N).
1st R.*, 429; 2nd R. *m*, 488; 3rd R., 530.

Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
Remarks on Mr. Plumb's Motion, 444-448; Further Remarks, 661-663.

Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. (139).
In Com., 1171.

Liquor License Act 1883 B. (134).
On 2nd R., 1172.

Militia Force Land Grant B. (160).
On 3rd R., 1425.

North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. (144).
On 2nd R., 1116.

North-West Rebellion, Provision for Families of Volunteers killed or wounded in.
On Mr. Alexander's Inquiry, 938.

North-West Rebellion, Vote of thanks to Gen. Middleton, the Militia, &c.
Sir Alex. Campbell's Motion seconded, 1392,

Offences against the Person B. (S).
In Com., 787; On 3rd R, 823.

Ontario Boundary Award referred to.
17.

Order, Question of.
On Mr. Alexander reading his speech, 1013.

Provincial Rights, a proper basis for, advocated.
18.

Public Loan B. (145).
On 2nd R., 1049; On 3rd R,, 1056.

Railway Land Subsidies B. (147).
On Motion for 2nd R., 1093; In Com., 1175.

Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
Adjournmt. of Debate on 2nd R. *m*, 79; Remarks on 2nd R., 173-178; In Com., 257, 259; Amt. to 22nd clause accepted, 263. 271, 273, 355, 364.
Amt. striking out 8th clause not accepted, 374.

Summary Proceedings B. (L).
On 2nd R., 394, 400-01.
In Com., 483-85, 528-29.

Temperance Act Petitions, Forgery of Signatures to.
Declaration presented, 988.

Washington Treaty, Fishery clauses of.
Remarks, 17.

Smith, Hon. Frank.

Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
Petition in favor of Amts. to, presented, 937.
On 2nd R., 711-14; On 3rd R., 967-70.

Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B. (153).
1st R.*, 1276.

Canned Goods B. (U).
In Com., 934.

General Inspection Act Amt. B. (135).
In Com., 1102, 1104.

Industries and Manufactures of Canada.
On Mr. Macdonald's Motion; Remarks, 745.

Maritime Court of Ontario Jurisdiction B. (11).
In Com., 533.

Sutherland, Hon. John.

Administration of Justice in the North-West Territories B. (V).
In Com., 1028.

North-West Territories Census B. (21).
On 2nd R., 126.

North-West Territories, Disposal of Lands in.
On Mr. Wark's Inquiry, 851.

Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
In Com., 261, 275; On Mr. Scott's Amts., 376.

Winnipeg Bank Incorp. Act Amt. B. (62).
1st R., 554; 2nd R., 598.

Speaker, The (Hon. William Miller).

Absence of Ministers from the Capital.
On Mr. Power's Motion for Address; Mr. Power's remarks ruled out of order, 167; Mr. Alexander's remarks ruled out of order, 171.

Adjournment (May 8th—20th).
On Mr. Bellerose's Motion Mr. Wark's Amt. declared out of order, 922.

Bank of Upper Canada.
On Mr. Alexander's Motion for Com.; Mr. Alexander's remarks ruled out of order, 60.

Banque du Peuple B. (53).
On 3rd R., 581.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. (92).
Ruling as to Quest. of order on Mr. Power's Amt., 854.

Divorce Cases.
As to proper preparation of papers relating to, 104.
Change of Procedure announced, 109.

Divorce Committees, Presence of Strangers at.
Construction of Rule, 324.

Evans Divorce B. (G).
On Motion for 3rd R., 367.

Evidence taken in Divorce Cases.
As to its being printed in French, 331.

Hatzfeld Divorce B. (D).
As to exclusion of strangers from the committee room, 122.

Industries and Manufactures of Canada, Report upon.
On Mr. Macdonald's Inquiry; As to adjournment of Debate, 155.

Joliette District, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials in.
Return presented, 663.

Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
As to regularity of Mr. Plumb's M., 80.

Library of Parliament.
Report of Acting Librarian presented, 5.

Order, Question of.
Mr. Alexander ruled out of order, 44.
Mr. Alexander's remarks ruled out of order as being irrelevant, 46.
Ruling as to a motion having no seconder, 47.
Mr. Alexander's remarks as to exclusion of strangers, and deficiency of messengers, ruled out of order, 105.
Question of, raised by Mr. Haythorne on Mr. Kaulbach's remarks.
Ruling upon, 421.
Mr. Alexander and Mr. Plumb ruled out of order, 456.
Mr. Alexander ruled out of order, 525.
Mr. Bellerose ruled to be not out of order, 560.
As to Mr. Alexander's Motion re Bank of Upper Canada. Decision postponed, 602; Decision given, 618.
Mr. Alexander ruled out of order, 707.
As to Discussion on Inquiries. Ruling, 809.
On Mr. Alexander's Inquiry as to the Public Affairs of the Dominion. Remarks and Ruling, 819.
On Mr. Howlan's remarks. Ruling, 846.
Mr. Alexander ruled out of order in reading his speech, 1013.
On Mr. Alexander's remarks, 1089.
As to propriety of Mr. Plumb's remarks in discussing the Franchise Bill, 1221.

Petitions for Private Bills.
As to extension of time for receiving, 51.

Privilege, Question of.
As to expunging of Mr. Alexander's speech from the reports.
Mr. Alexander called to order, 242.
Strangers ordered to withdraw, 242.
In reply to Mr. Haythorne, 466.

Prorogation announced.
1432.

Railway Subsidies B. (158).
On 3rd R., Amts. of Mr. Power, Mr. Trudel and Mr. Bellerose ruled out of order, 1419.

Senators, newly appointed, names of announced.
3.

Smith Divorce Bill.
Telegram read, 51; as to mode of examining witness, 52; as to selection of Com., 55.

Speech from the Throne reported.
5.

Temperance Legislation, as to presentation of petition concerning, by Mr. Almon.
579.

Vote of Censure upon Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Alexander's remarks ruled out of order, 219.

Sullivan, Hon. Michael.

Summoned to the Senate.
3.

Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.
Seconded, 8.

British Medical Acts.
Motion for return agreed to, 47.

Canada Congregational Missionary Society's B. (54).
3rd R. *m*, 408.

Registration of Medical Practitioners.
Motion for address, 450.

Thibadeau, Hon. Joseph Rosaire.

Banque du Peuple B. (53).
On 3rd R., 585.

Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
In Com., 883.

Trudel, Hon. F. X. A.

Banque du Peuple B. (53).
On 3rd R., 583 and 586.

Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B. (153).
On 3rd R., 1382, 1387.

Chapais, Senator, the late.
Remarks concerning, 1389.

Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
In Com., 903.

Consolidated Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. (146).
In Com., 1293.

Consolidated Militia Act Amt. B (152).
On 3rd R., 1287, 1290.

Electoral Franchise B. (103).
On 2nd R., 1230-1233; In Com., 1281-84.

Half-breed Claims in the North-West.
Motion for Correspondence, 644.

Half-breed Grievances in the North-West, Correspondence in relation to.
On Mr. Alexander's Motion for Return, 1032.

Manitoba Claims Final Settlement B. (155).
On 2nd R., 1303.

Members of the Royal Society and the Civil Service Examinations.
Inquiry, 408; See also 428.

North-West Troubles, Correspondence in relation to.
Motion for Return, 1034.

North-West Rebellion, Assistance to Sufferers.
Inquiry, 1274.

North-West Rebellion, Trials at Regina, Conduct of.
Inquiry, 1274.

North-West Rebellion, Vote of thanks to Gen. Middleton, the Militia, &c.
Remarks, 1395.

North-West Rebellion, Investigation by Government into causes of, extent of Damage, &c.
Inquiry, 1410.

North Shore Railway, Indemnity to Province of Quebec on account of.
Motion for Return agreed to, 105.

Pontiac & Pacific Junction Railway matters.
Motion for Return, 1092.

Pontiac & Pacific Junction Railway, Cost of.
Inquiry, 1411.

Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
On 2nd R., 184; In Com., 248, 252, 253, 254, 258, 264, 266, 269, 275, 358, 360; On Mr. Scott's Amts, 377.
3 Amts to 12th clause not accepted, 380.

Railway Subsidies B. (158).
On 2nd R., 1405; In Com. Amt. (to 1st clause) lost on div., 1415; On 3rd R. same Amt. ruled out of order, 1418.

Short Line Railway.
Remarks on Mr Power's Motion for address for copies of Reports of Surveys, &c., 345.

Smith Divorce Bill.
On Motion for 2nd R., suggestion that each stage of bill be entered on the minutes as being carried on a division, 29.

Surveyors in the North-West, Damage done by.
Inquiry, 1035.

Turner, Hon. James.

Canned Goods B. (U).
On 2nd R., 931; In Com., 932-37.

Hamilton Provident and Loan So's B. (J).
1st R.*, 178; 2nd R. *m*, 221; 3rd R. *m*, 390.
Amts. of H. of Com. concurr. in, Motion, 728.

Hatzfeld Divorce B. (D).
On 1st Rep. of Com., 121.

Industries and Manufactures of Canada.
Remarks, 474-77.
On Mr. Macdonald's Motion Remarks, 780.

Maritime Court of Ontario Jurisdiction B. (11).
In Com., 531-33, 554; 3rd R. *m*, 564.

Vidal, Hon. Alexander.

Administration of Justice in North-West Territories B. (V).
Rep. from Com., 1029.

Alberta & Arthabaska R. R. Co's Incorp. B. (78).
1st R.*, 488; Motion for 2nd R. postponed, 530; 2nd R. Motion, 612; Concurr. in Amts, 685; 3rd R., 723.

Canada Congregational Missionary Society B. (54).
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R. *m*, 369.

Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
1st R., 587; 2nd R. postponed, 622; 2nd R. *m*, 665-74; Motion to go into Com. postponed, 790; Further postponement, 813; Quest. of Order on Mr. Power's Amt., 852; In Com., 855-898; On Concurr. in Amts., 914-918; Motion for 3rd R., 918; On Motion for Postponemt. of 3rd R., 923; N. of Motion 3rd R., 932; On 3rd R. 970-72, 975, 976-78; As to Insistence upon Senate Amts., 1153-1167.

Canada Temperance Act.
Presbyterian Church Assembly Petition presented, 1122.

Chinese Immigration Restriction and Regulation B. (155).
On 2nd R., 1297.

Consolidated Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. (146).
Rep. from Com., 1294.

Electoral Franchise B. (103).
In Com., 1276; On 3rd R., 1337.

Evans Divorce B. (G).
On M. for 3rd R. Amt. *m*, 367.

Gas and Gas Meters Inspection B. (119).
Rep. from Com., 1086.

Insolvent Banks and Trading Corporations Act Amt. B. (N).
Rep. from Com., 531.

Liquor License Act 1883 B. (134).
On 2nd R., 1173.
London Life Ins. Co's Acts. Amt. B (76).
1st R.*, 932.
Manitoba Lands Final Settlement B. (155).
On 2nd R., 1304.
Preservation of Peace near Public Works Act Amt. Act B. (O).
On 2nd R., 596
Privilege, Question of.
As to expunging of Mr. Alexander's speech from the Reports, 239.
Railway Land Subsidy B. (147).
Rep. from Com., 1177.

Wark, Hon. David.

Adjournment (May 11th—28th).
Notice of Motion, 918; On Mr. Bellerose's Motion, 919.
Canada Temperance Act 1878 Amt. B. (92).
In Com., 868, 878; On adjournment of debate, 987.
Canned Goods B. (U).
In Com., 935.
Central Bank of New Brunswick B. (40).
1st R., 513; 2nd R. *m*, 536; 3rd R., 640.
Chinese Immigration Restriction and Regulation B. (155).
On 2nd R., 1298.
Civil Service Acts Consolidation B. (31).
On 3rd R., 930.
Consolidated Insurance Act 1877 Modification B. (20).
On 2nd R., 1152; In Com., 1178.
Consolidated Militia Act Amt. B. (152).
On 3rd R., 1288.
Food, Drugs etc, Adulteration B. (W).
On 2nd R., 945; In Com., 1041.
Fredericton & St. Mary's R. R. Bridge Co's B. (50).
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 523; 3rd R., 685.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. (135).
On 2nd R., 1092.
Joint Com. on the Division of Business, Progress of.
Inquiry, 1034.
Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. (139).
In Com., 1170.
Manitoba Claims Final Settlement B. (155).
On 2nd R., 1302.
North-West Territories, Disposal of Lands in.
Inquiry, 841.
North-West Troubles, Information Concerning.
Inquiry, 639.
Parliamentary Returns, Number and Expense of.
On Mr. Flint's Motion for Return, 516.
Prince Edward Island, Communication with.
On Mr. Howlan's Inquiry, 508.
Railway Subsidies B. (158).
On 2nd R., 1404.
Real Property in the North-West Territories B. (A).
In Com., 253.
Statutes, Consolidation of, Appointment of Joint Com. upon.
Remarks, 322.
Timber Culling and Measuring Acts Amt. B. (154).
On 2nd R., 1294.
Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. (118).
On 2nd R., 940.
York Station, P. E. Island Railway.
On Mr. Haythorne's Inquiry, 564.

II.—INDEX TO SUBJECTS.

Acts, number of, passed by Dominion and Provincial Parliaments.
See Mr. Plumb's remarks, 432;

Addresses asked for in the Senate and House of Commons, number and cost of.
Motion (Mr. Flint) 514; Debate 514-517.

Address, in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.
Consideration *m*, (*Sir A. Campbell*) 5; Address *m* (*Mr. Macdonald, B. C.*) 5; seconded (*Mr. Sullivan*) 8; Debate (*Mr. Alexander*) 10; (*Mr. Scott*) 13; (*Mr. Girard*) 18; (*Mr. Bellerose*) 19; (*Mr. Haythorne*) 20; Motion agreed to, 22.

Adjournment of Debate, Propriety of Motion upon an Inquiry.
See *Inquiries*.

Adjournment (February 13th—20th).
Mr. Bellerose's Motion agreed to, 49.

Adjournment (March 27th—April 8th).
Motion (*Sir A. Campbell*) 454; Remarks (*Mr. Power*), (*Mr. Almon*), (*Mr. Alexander*) 454; (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 456; (*Mr. Read*), (*Mr. O'Donohoe*), (*Mr. Haythorne*), (*Mr. Plumb*), 457; Motion agreed to on a Div., 458.

Adjournment suggested.
Remarks (*Mr. Power*), (*Sir A. Campbell*), (*Mr. Almon*) 822.

Adjournment (May 8th—20th).
Not. of Motion (*Mr. Bellerose*) 851; Motion made ,918; Remarks (*Mr. Macdonald B. C.* (*Mr. Wark*), (*Mr. Kaulbach*), (*Sir A. Campbell*) 919; (*Mr. Alexander*) 920; (*Mr. O'Donohoe*), (*Mr. Haythorne*) 921; (*Mr. Read*), (*Mr. Flint*), 922; Carried on a Div., 922.

Adjournment (May 11th—28th).
Not. of M. (*Mr. Wark*) 918; moved as an amt. to Mr. Bellerose's M., 919; Ruled to be out of Order, 922.

Adjournment (May 29th—June 2nd).
Motion (*Mr. Bellerose*) agreed to, 1033.

Adjournment (June 2nd—10th).
Moved in amt. to Mr. Nelson's, M. and agreed to, (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1039.

Adjournment (June 2nd—22nd).
M. (*Mr. Nelson*) 1038; Amendment (June 2nd—10th) *Sir A. Campbell*) 1038; Remarks (*Mr. Read*), (*Mr. Haythorne*), (*Mr. Plumb*) 1038; Amt. carried, 1039.

Adjournment (June 11th—15th).
M. (*Mr. Bellerose*) agreed to, 1047.

Adjournment (June 19th—July 2nd).
M. (*Mr. McInnes B. C.*) 1088; Debate (*Mr. Plumb*), (*Mr. Ogilvie*), (*Sir A. Campbell*), (*Mr. Alexander*) 1088; (*Mr. Haythorne*) 1089; M. agreed to, 1090.

Advances to the Provinces B. (7).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 564; 2nd R. *m*, 598; in Com., 615; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 616; assent, 814.

Alberta and Athabaska Railway Company's Incorp. B. (73).—*Mr. Vidal.*
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. postponed *m*, 530; 2nd R. *m*, 612; rep. from Com., and concurr. in Amts., 685; 3rd R.*, 723; assent, 1430.

Albion Mines Savings Bank B. (15).—*Mr. McKay.*
1st R.*, 382; 2nd R. *m*, 411; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 535; assent, 814.

Agricultural Fertilizers B. (122).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1051; 2nd R. *m*, 1084; in Com., rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 1087; assent, 1430.

Assent to Bills.
By the Deputy-Governor 814; By the Governor-General 1430.

Banks, Acts relating to.
See *British Columbia Bank.*
Banque du Peuple.
Central Bank of New Brunswick.
Commercial Bank of Windsor.
Federal Bank.
Insolvent Banks.
Winnipeg Bank.

Banque du Peuple B. (53).—*Mr. Paquet.*
1st R.*, 429; 2nd R. *m*, 466; rep. from Com., 579; M. to refer back to Com. for Amt. (Mr. Bellerose) lost on a div., 586; 3rd R.*, 587; assent, 814.

Bank of British Columbia B. (105).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R. *m*, 1054; rep. from Com. and 3rd R*, 1083; assent, 1430.

Bank of Montreal Pension Fund Society's Incorp. B. (49).—*Mr. Ryan.*
1st R.*, 429; 2nd R. *m*, 523; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 535; assent, 814.

Bank of Upper Canada, Realizing of Assets of.
Enquiry (*Mr. Alexander*) 35; Remarks (*Mr. Allan*) 36; (*Sir D. L. Macpherson*) 39; (*Mr. Plumb*) 44; Reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 44.

Bank of Upper Canada Investigation into affairs of.
M. for Com. (*Mr. Alexander*) 58; Reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 61; Remarks (*Mr. Gowan*) 63; (*Mr. Allan*) 65; (*Sir D. L. Macpherson*) 66; (*Mr. Plumb*) 67; (*Mr. Scott*) 68.

Bank of Upper Canada, Realization of Assets of.
M. for address (*Mr. Alexander*) postponed, 480.

Bank of Upper Canada, the estate of.
M. for Com. of Enquiry (*Mr. Alexander*) 599; Quest. of Order raised (*Mr. Dickey*) 599; Deb. (*Mr. Alexander*) 600; (*Mr. Power*) 601; (*Mr. Howlan*) 602; (*Mr. Gowan*) 602; (*The Speaker*) 602; Decision reserved 602; The Speaker's Ruling 618.

Bank of Winnipeg Act Incorp. B. (62).—*Mr. Sutherland.*
1st R., 554; 2nd R. *m*, 598; rep. from Com., concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R. *m*, 640; assent, 814.

Banking and Commerce Committee.
List of Members 23; 1st Rep. (Reduction of Quorum), *Mr. Plumb* 29.

Benson, Senator, the late.
M. to adjourn out of respect to his memory, (*Sir A. Campbell*) 350; Remarks (*Mr. Scott*), (*Mr. Flint*), (*Mr. Plumb*) 351.

BILLS.

Railways, an Act relating to.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*,5.

(A) An Act respecting real property in the North-West Territories.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 22; 2nd *M.*,70; Debate adjourned 79; Debate continued, 173-178; Debate adjourned (on M. of *Sir D. L. Macpherson*) 178; Debate continued, 179-198; Debate adjourned, (on M. of *Mr. Alexander*) 198; Debate resumed, 199-209; 2nd R. agreed to, 209; in Com., 242-256; Amt. to 12th clause (*Sir A. Campbell*), 258; 22nd clause amended, 263; 32nd clause amended, 268; 72nd clause amended, 274; 108th clause amended, 275; in Com. again, 352-365; 127th clause amended, 365; in Com. again, 373; rep. from Com., 374; on M for Concurr. in Amts., *Mr. Scott's* Amt (to strike out clause 8) rejected on division, 374; *Mr. Trudel's* 3 Amts. rejected, 380; *Mr. Dickey's* Amt. (to leave out clause 91) rejected, 381; *Mr. Power's* Amt. (to leave out clause 11), rejected, 381; *rep.* of Com., Concurr. in, and 3rd R, 382.

(B) An Act for the relief of Charles Smith.—*Mr. Read.*
1st R. and M. for 2nd R., 29; 2nd R. on a division, 51; ref. to select Com. *m.* carried on division, 54; 1st *rep.* of Com adopted (on M of *Mr. Gowan*) 111; *rep.* against by Com., 256; *rep.* of Com. adopted, 368; refund of fees, *m.*, 1275.

(C) An Act for the relief of Amanda Esther Davis—*Mr. Ogilvie,*
1st R. and M. for 2nd R., 29; 2nd R. postponed, 56; 2nd R (on M. of *Mr. Ogilvie*), 103; ref. to Select Com., *m*, 103; 1st *rep.* of Com. adopted (on M. of *Mr. Dickey*), 104; *rep.* from Com., 111; *rep.* adopted (on M. of *Mr. Dickey*), on a division, 128; 3rd R. (on M. of *Mr. Read*), 155; message to House of Commons, 156.

(D) An Act for the relief of George Louis Emil Hatzfeld.—*Mr. Kaulbach.*
1st R.*, 34; proof of service, 116; 2nd R., 117; ref. to Select Com., 120; 1st *rep.* of Com. adopted (on M. of *Mr Kaulbach*), 120; petition of wife received and ref. to Com., 130; *rep.* from Com. (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 198; *rep.* of Com. adopted on a division, 276; 3rd R. on a division, 368; assent, 814.

(E) An Act for the relief of Fairy Emily Jane Terry.—*Mr. Read*
1st R.*, 34; proof of service, 110; 2nd R. and ref to Select Com., 111; 1st *rep.* of Com. adopted (on M. of *Mr. Odell*), 111; *rep.* from Com. (*Mr. Odell*), 238; *rep.* of Com. adopted, 276; 3rd R. *m.*, 331; assent, 814.

(F) An Act further to amend an Act intituled "An Act respecting offences against the person."—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R. and M. for 2nd R., 48; 2nd R. *m.*, 57; In Com, 108; 3rd R, 481; assent 1430.

(G) An Act for the relief of Alice Elvira Evans.—*Mr. Gowan.*
1st R., 49; proof of service, 112; 2nd R., 113; ref. to Select Com., 114; 1st *rep.* of Com. adopted (on M. of *Mr. Gowan*), 122; *rep.* from Com. 198; *rep.* of Com. adopted and M. for 3rd R., 280; Amt. adopted, 367; 3rd R. *m.*, 365-368; assent, 814.

(H) An Act for the relief of George Branford Cox.—*Mr. Read.*
1st R. and M. for 2nd R., 106; 2nd R. postponed, 405; 2nd R. further postponed, 513; proof of service, 664; 2nd R. and ref. to Com. *m.* 665; *rep.* of Com. and 3rd R., 736; assent, 1340.

(I) An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Sisters of Charity of the North-West Territories. — *Mr. Girard.*
1st R.*, 131; 2nd R. *m.*, 268; *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 407; assent, 814.

(J) An Act to comprise in one Act a Limitation of the Share and Loan Capital of the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—*Mr. Turner.*
1st R.*, 178; 2nd R. *m.*, 221; *rep.* from Com. *m.* 370; 3rd R., 390; Amts. of House of Commons concurred in, *m.*, 728.

(K) An Act respecting explosive substances.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 179; 2nd R. *m.* 221; In Com., 276; *rep.* from Com., 278; 3rd R., *m*, 280; assent, 814.

(L) An Act to make further provision respecting summary proceedings before justices and other magistrates.—*Mr. Gowan.*
1st R.*, 331; 2nd R. *m*, 390; Debate thereon, 390-405; M. for 6 months' hoist (*Mr. O'Donohoe*) lost on division, 405; In Com., 481; 2nd clause amended, 481; 4th clause amended, 484; 6th clause amended, 487; In Com. again, 525; 2nd clause amended, 525; *rep.* from Com., 529: 3rd R. *m*, 536.

(M) An Act respecting proof of entries in books of account kept by officers of the Crown. — *Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 352; 2nd R. *m*, 407; In Com., *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 412; consideration of Amts. of House of Commons, 1047; Amts concurred in, 1082; assent, 1430.

(N) An Act further to amend the Act respecting Insolvent banks, insurance companies, loan companies, building societies, and trading corporations—*Mr. Scott.*
1st R.*, 429; 2nd R.*, 488: In Com., 530; *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 531.

(O) An Act further to amend the Act for the better preservation of peace in the vicinity of public works.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 523; 2nd R. *m.*, 596; In Com., *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 623; assent, 1430.

(P) An Act to amend the Act respecting the Central Prison for the Province of Ontario—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 523: 2nd R. *m*,, 597; In Com., *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 615; assent, 1430.

(Q) An Act to amend the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 649; 2nd R. *m.*, 685; In Com., 733; dropped, 990.

(R) An Act to make further provision respecting pawnbrokers. — *Mr. Gowan.*
1st R.*, 663; 2nd R. *m.*, 723; In Com., 736-738; *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R. *m.*, 738; assent, 1430.

(S) An Act to further amend the Act respecting offences against the person.—*Mr. Gowan.*
1st R.*, 663; 2nd R. *m.*, 725; Amt. (3 months hoist) *Mr. Almon*, lost on division, 728; In Com., 784-790; Amt to 1st clause (*Mr. Gowan*) adopted, 788; Amt to 2nd clause (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 788; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Power*) *m.*, 789; lost and Amt. carried, 790; *rep.* from Com. 790; on Concurr. *Mr. Dickey's* Amt. adopted on a division, 813; 3rd R. *m*, 822; Amt. (3 months' hoist) *Mr. Almon*, 823; rejected on a division, 825; M. for 3rd R. rejected on a division, 825.

(T) An Act respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 791; 2nd R. *m.*, 840; *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 851; assent 1430.

(U) An Act regarding canned goods—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 898; 2nd R. *m.* 930; In Com., 932-937; *rep.* from Com. and Concurr. in Amts, 937; on M. for 3rd R. clause 3 struck out, and clause 4 amended, 988; 3rd R. postponed, 988; postponed again, 990, 3rd R., 1024; Concurr. in Amts. of House of Commons, 1119; assent, 1430.

(V) An Act respecting the administration of justice, and other matters in the North-West Territories.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 931; 2nd R, *m.* 942; In Com., 1025; *rep.* from Com., 1029; 3rd R. *m.*, 1033; Amts. of House of Commons agreed to, 1396; assent 1430.

(W) An Act respecting the adulteration of food, drugs, and agricultural fertilizers.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 931; 2nd R, *m.*, 944; In Com., 1039-1044; clause 2 amended, 1039;

rep. from Com., concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R., 1044; Concurr. in Amts. of House of Commons, 1118 and 1167; assent, 1430.

(6) An Act to further amend the Law of Evidence in criminal courts—*Mr. Power.*
1st R.*, 382; 2nd R. *m.* 565. Debate, 565-578; M. rejected on a division, 578;

(7) An Act respecting certain advances to the Provinces.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 564; 2nd R. *m.*, 598; In Com., 615; *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 616; assent, 814.

(8) An Act respecting the River St. Clair Railway, Bridge and Tunnell Co.—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 111; 2nd R. *m.* 127; *rep* from Com. and 3rd R. *m.* 331; assent, 814.

(9) An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway and Erie and Niagara Railway Co.—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 130; 2nd *m.*, 178; *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R. *m.*, 331; assent, 814.

(10) An Act to reduce the stock of the Federal Bank of Canada and for other purposes—*Mr Allan.*
1st R.*, 256; 2nd R. *m.*, 268; *rep* from Com. and 3rd R., 350; assent, 814.

(11) An Act to extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario. —*Sir A. Campbell*
1st R.*, 382; 2nd R. *m.* (*Mr. Turner*), 512; In Com., 531-535; In Com. again, 554; 1st and 2nd clauses amended, 554; *rep* from Com. 554; 3rd R *m.* 564.

(15) An Act to continue the Act respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank.—*Mr. McKay.*
1st R.*, 382; 2nd R. *m.* 411; *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 535; assent, 814.

(20) An Act to modify the application of the Consolidated Insurance Act of 1877.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.* 1093; 2nd R. *m.* 1151: In Com. 1177-1181; *rep* from Com., 1181; 3rd R. *m.* 1194; assent, 1430.

(21) An Act to Provide for the Taking of a Census in the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin. —*Sir Alexander Campbell.*
1st R.*, 111; 2nd R., 123; in Com., 279; R. from Com., 280; 3rd R., *m* 331; assent, 814.

(23) An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Wood Mountain & Qu'Appelle Railway Co.—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R., *m*, 369; R. from Com. and 3rd R., *m*, 465; assent, 814

(24) An Act to incorporate the Lake Erie, Essex, and Detroit River Railway Co.—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R., *m*, 411; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 465; assent, 814.

(26) An Act to Provide a Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons. —*Sir Alexander Campbell.*
1st R.*, 108; 2nd R., 114; Rep. from Com. without amt., 116; 3rd R., 122; assent, 814.

(28) An Act to incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company. — *Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 1143; 2nd R., *m*, 1192; Rep. from Com.; Concurr in Amts. and 3rd R., *m*, 1193; assent 1430.

(31) An Act to amend and Consolidate the Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883, 1884.—*Sir Alexander Campbell.*
1st R.*, 760; 2nd R., *m* 825; Debate, 825-839; in Com., 898; cl. 3 amended, 899; Mr. Power's amt. to cl. 8 withdrawn, 905; on cl. 346, Mr. Power's] Amt. '(names to be 'arranged in order of merit) lost on a div., 907; Rep. from Com. and Concurr in Amts., 914; 3rd R., *m* 927-30; 3rd amt. disagreed to in H. of C. and receded from, 1046; assent, 1430.

(37) An Act further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Co.—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 405; 2nd R., *m* 411; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 465; assent, 814.

(38) An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western & Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Co.—*Mr. McMaster.*
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R., *m* 369; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 407; assent, 814.

(39) An Act to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Qu'Appelle and for other purposes connected therewith.—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R, *m* 411; Rep from Com. and 3rd R., *m* 465; assent, 814

(40) An Act further relating to the Central Bank of New Brunswick. —*Mr. Wark.*
1st R.*, 513; 2nd R.. *m* 536; Rep. from

Com.; concurr in Amts. and 3rd R., *m* 640; assent, 814.

(41) An Act respecting Infectious or Contagious Diseases Affecting Animals.—*Sir Alexander Campbell.*
1st R.*, 735; 2nd R., *m* 790; in Com., 839; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R, 840; assent, 1430.

(43) An Act to Authorize the Royal Canadian Insurance Co. to reduce its capital stock, and for other purposes.—*Mr. Ryan.*
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R., *m* 522; Rep from Com. and 3rd R., *m* 587; assent 814.

(48) An Act respecting the Annuity and Guarantee Funds Society of the Bank of Montreal.—*Mr. Ryan.*
1st R.*, 429; 2nd R., *m* 522; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 535; assent, 814.

(49) An Act to incorporate the Pension Fund Society of the Bank of Montreal.—*Mr. Ryan.*
1st R.*, 429; 2nd R., *m* 523; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 535; assent, 814.

(50) An Act to incorporate the Fredericton & St. Mary's Railway Bridge Co.—*Mr. Wark.*
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R., *m* 523; Rep. from Com.; Concurr in Amts and 3rd R., *m* 685; assent, 814.

(51) An Act for granting certain powers to the International Coal Co., (Limited).—*Mr. Ogilvie.*
1st R.*. 350; Placed on the Orders of the Day, *m* 352; 2nd R., (on M. of Mr. Power) 382; Rep from Com., 407; concurr in amts. and 3rd R., 408; assent, 814.

(52) An Act respecting the Sault Ste Marie Bridge Co.—*Mr. Power.*
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R., *m* 368; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 407; assent 814.

(53) An Act respecting La Banque du Peuple.—*Mr. Paquet.*
1st R.*, 429; 2nd R. *m*, 466; rep. from Com., 579; M. to refer back to com. for amt. (Mr. Bellerose) lost on a div., 586; 3rd R*, 587; assent, 814.

(54) An Act respecting the Canada Congregational Missionary Society.—*Mr. Vidal.*
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R., *m*, 369; rep. from com. and 3rd R. *m*, 408; assent, 814.

(55) An Act for granting certain powers to the Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Ins. Association.—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 650; 2nd R. *m*, 686; rep. from Com., concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R., 841; assent, 1430.

(59) An Act to incorporate the Brantford, Waterloo & Lake Erie Railway Company.—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 350; 2nd R. *m*, 382; rep. from Com., 408; concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R. *m*, 466; assent, 814.

(60) An Act to incorporate the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada.—*Mr. McClelan.*
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 530; rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 705; assent, 814.

(61) An Act to further amend the Acts incorporating the Richelieu Navigation Company, and the Richelieu & Ontario Navigation Company.—*Mr. Pelletier.*
1st R.*, 760; 2nd R. *m*, 810; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 841; assent, 1430.

(62) An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—*Mr. Sutherland.*
1st R.*, 554; 2nd R. *m*, 598; rep. from Com., concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R. *m*, 640; assent, 814.

(69) An Act respecting the Huron & Ontario Ship Canal Company.
1st R.*, 554; placed on the orders *m* (Mr. Vidal) 596; 2nd R. (Mr. Gowan *m*, 613; rep. from Com., concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R., 685; assent, 814.

(72) An Act respecting the Ontario & Pacific Railway Company.—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 554; 2nd R. *m*, 598; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 684; assent, 814.

(73) An Act to incorporate the Alberta & Athabaska Railway Company.—*Mr. Vidal.*
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. postponed *m*, 530; 2nd R. *m*, 612; rep. from Com. and concurr. in Amts., 685; 3rd R.*, 723; assent, 1430.

(74) An Act respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Co. of Canada.—*Mr. Girard.*
1st R., 650; 2nd R. *m*, 686; rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 841; assent, 1430.

(75) An Act to incorporate the Canadian Pacific Railway Employees' Relief Association.—*Mr. Scott.*
1st R.*, 554; placed in the orders *m* (Mr. Scott) 596; 2nd R. *m*, 613; rep. from Com. and 3rd R. *m*, 640; assent, 814.

(76) An Act to amend the Acts respecting the London Life Insurance Co.—*Mr. Vidal.*
1st R.*, 932; 2nd R. *m*, 988; rep. from

Com. and 3rd R.*, 1012; assent, 1430.

(77) An Act to incorporate the Hamilton, Guelph & Buffalo Railway Co.—*Mr. Plumb.*

1st R.*. 554; 2nd R. *m*, 612; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 684; assent, 814.

(79) An Act to incorporate the Rush Lake & Saskatchewan Railway & Navigation Co.—*Mr. Girard.*

1st R.*, 649; 2nd R. *m*, 686; rep. from Com., 816; concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R., 840; assent, 1430.

(80) An Act to incorporate the Fort Macleod Ranche Telegraph Co.—*Mr. Girard.*

1st R.*, 932; 2nd R. *m*, 945; rep. from Com., concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R., 1046; assent, 1430.

(81) An Act respecting the Canada Co-operative Supply Association (Limited).—*Mr. Ryan.*

1st R*, 429; 2nd R. *m*, 522; rep. from Com. and 3rd R. *m*, 599; assent, 814.

(87) An Act to amend the Act intituled "An Act to provide for the employment without the walls of Common Jails of Prisoners sentenced to imprisonment therein."—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 898; 2nd R. *m*, 931; 3rd R. *m*, 932; assent, 1430.

(91) An Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company.—*Mr. Girard.*

1st R.*, 650; 2nd R., *m*, 728; rep. from Com., 815; concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R., 816; assent, 1430.

(92) An Act further to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, and the Liquor License Act of 1883.—*Mr. Vidal.*

1st R.*, 587; 2nd R., postponed, 622; 2nd R *m*, 665; debate, 665-684; deb. adj. *m*, 684; deb. cont'd, 687-705; M. in Amt. (3 months' hoist) Mr. Dickey, 696; deb. adj., 705; deb. continued, 711-723; deb. adj., 723; deb. concluded, 728-33; Mr. Dickey's Amt. withdrawn, 732; 2nd R., 733; going into com. postponed, 790; postponed again, 813; Mr. Power's M. (three-fifths of votes polled to be required) 852; quest. of order raised (Mr. Vidal) 852, and Mr. Botsford, 853; Speaker rules M. out of order, 854; in Com., 855; clause 2 amended, 855; clause 3 amended, 857; on clause 5, Mr. McMillan's Amt. (as to medical practitioners) agreed to, 8 9-868; further Amt. agreed to, 869-70; Mr. Almon's Amt. (permitting sale of light wines and beer) moved, 873; debate, 873-98; adopted on a div., 898; rep from Com., 898; on concurr. in Amts. Mr. Vidal moves for postpmt., 914; Mr. Dickey's Amt. (that the Amts. be now concurred in) carried on a division, 918; 3rd R. postponed, 923-27; 3rd R. postpd again, 932; 3rd R. *m*, 946; deb. 946-987; Mr. Power's Amt. (majority of three-fifths of votes polled instead of one-half to be required) rejected on a div., 972; Mr. McMillan's Amt. (as to sale by medical practitioners) carried on a div., 974; B. in Com. again and rep. from Com., 975; on M. for 3rd R. Mr. Nelson's Amt. to 2nd section lost on a div., 976; Mr. Vidal's Amt. (to strike out the clause exempting beer, wine, &c) *m*, 976; adj. of deb. *m* (Mr. Scott) carried on a div., 987; deb. contd, 990-1011; Mr. Vidal's Amt. rejected, 1011; M. for 3rd R. carried on a div., 1011; message from H. of C. as to Senate Amts. recd., 1095; amts. of the Senate adhered to, 1153-1167.

(94) An Act to incorporate the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—*Mr. Plumb.*

1st R*, 711; 2nd R. *m*, 736; rep. from com., 815; concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R., 840; assent, 1430.

(101) An Act to amend the Law respecting Bridges, Booms and other Works constructed over or in Navigable Waters, under the authority of Provincial Acts.—*Mr. Macfarlane.*

1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 536; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 598; assent, 1430.

(102) An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Department of Secretary of State.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 488; 2nd R *m*, 536; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 598; assent, 1430.

(103) An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1168; 2nd R. *m*, 1194-1200; Amt. (3 months' hoist) Mr. Scott, 1200-06; debate, 1,206-53; adj. of deb., 1253; deb. concluded, 1253-72; 2nd R. carried on a div., 1272; in Com., 1276-1287; rep. from com., 1287; 3rd R. *m*, 1329; debate, 1329-44; Amt. (exempting Prince Edward Island) Mr. Haythorne *m*, 1330; lost on a div., 1340; Amt. (extending manhood suffrage to all the Provinces) Mr. Scott, lost on a div., 1341, Amt. (exempting Quebec from provisions of Act) Mr. Bellerose, lost on div., 1342; Amt. (as to preparation of voters' lists); Amt. (as to

definition of "person") Mr. Power and Mr. DeBoucherville's Amt. thereto, lost, &c., 1343; Amt. (inserting "unless he be a Christian") Mr. DeBoucherville, lost, 1343; M. for 3rd R. carried on a div., 1344; assent, 1430.

(104) An Act to amend the Sections of the Act therein mentioned relating to the constitution of the Treasury Board.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st and 2nd R's, 914; 3rd R. *m*, 927; assent, 1430.

(105) An Act respecting the Bank of British Columbia.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R. *m*, 1054; rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 1083; assent, 1430.

(108) An Act to amend the Act 45 Vic., chap. 17, to encourage the construction of Dry Docks—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 513; in Com., rep. from Com., and 3rd R., 622; assent, 814.

(117) An Act respecting the Commercial Bank of Windsor.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R. *m*, 1051; rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 1083; assent, 1430.

(118) An Act further to amend the Acts relating to Weights and Measures.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 931; 2nd R. *m*, 939; in com., 1024; rep. from com. and 3rd R., 1025; assent, 1430.

(119) An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the inspection of gas and gas meters.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R.*, 1082; in com., 1085; rep. from com. and 3rd R., 1036; assent, 1430.

(122) An Act respecting Agricultural Fertilizers.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R*., 1051; 2nd R. *m*, 1084; in com., rep. from com. and 3rd R.*, 1087; assent, 1430.

(126) An Act to provide for the fitting representation of Canada at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, to be held in London in the year 1886.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R. *m*, 1052; in com., rep. from com. and 3rd R., 1086; assent, 1430.

(133) An Act further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R.*, 1082; in com., rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 1085; assent, 1430.

(134) An Act respecting the Liquor License Act, 1883.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1122; 2nd R. *m*, 1171; in Com., rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 1272; assent, 1430.

(135) An Act further to amend the General Inspection Act, 1874, and the Acts amending the same.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1088; 2nd R. *m*, 1090; in Com., 1097-1108, 1119-1122; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 1122: assent, 1430.

(139) An Act to amend the Act in relation to the Library of Parliament.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, and M. for 2nd R., 1095; 2nd R., 1108; in Com., 1168-71; rep. from com. and 3rd R.*, 1171; assent, 1430.

(144) An Act to authorize the augmentation of the North-West Mounted Police.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1093; 2nd R. *m*, 1115; 3rd R.*, 1150; assent, 1430.

(145) An Act to authorize the raising by way of loan of certain sums of money for the public service.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1048; 2nd R. *m*, 1048; debate, 1048-51; M. agreed to, 1051; 3rd R. *m*, 1055; debate, 1056-1082; M. agreed to, 1082; assent, 1430.

(146) An Act to amend the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1143; 2nd R.*, 1192; in Com., 1293; rep. from Com., 1294; 3rd R. *m*, 1305; assent, 1430.

(147) An Act to authorize the grant of certain subsidies in land for the construction of the railways therein mentioned.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1093; M. for 2nd R., 1093; 2nd R. *m*, 1150; in Com., 1175; rep. from Com., and 3rd R.*, 1177; assent, 1430.

(148) An Act to amend the Acts respecting the appointment of a Harbor Master at the port of Halifax.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1093; 2nd R. *m*, 1108; in Com. and rep. from Com., 1167; 3rd R. *m*, 1168; assent, 1430.

(149) An Act for granting to Her Majesty the sum of $1,700,000,

required for defraying certain expenses in connection with the troubles in the North-West Territories.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1093; 2nd R. *m*, 1150; 3rd R. *m*, 1168; assent, 1430.

(150) An Act to authorize the advance of a certain sum to the Harbor Commissioners of Three Rivers.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1122; 2nd R. *m*, 1175; in Com. and rep. from com., 1193; 3rd R. *m*, 1194; assent, 1430.

(152) An Act to amend the Consolidated Militia Act, 1883.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R*, 1193; 2nd R. *m*, 1273; 3rd R. *m*, 1287; assent. 1430.

(153) An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to provide for the successful completion and operation thereof.—*Mr. Smith.*
1st R.*, 153; 2nd R. *m* (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1305-1318; debate, 1318-1328; M. agreed to, 1326; in Com., 1344; Amt. (terminus in British Columbia to be at Port Moody) *m*, 1345; debate 1353-69; Amt. rejected on a div., 1369; rep. from Com., 1369; on 3rd R. Amt. (insertion of certain words) *Sir A. Campbell m*, agreed to, 1369; deb. on 3rd R., 1370; Amt. (lien of Govt. to apply to English Bay extension) *Mr. Power m*, 1379; withdrawn, 1385; Amt. (terminus to be at Port Moody) *Mr. McInnes m*, 1385; lost on a div,, 1386; Amt. (no change in terminus for ten years) *m Mr McInnes*, lost on a div., 1387; Amt. as to harbor at English Bay) *Mr. Power*, lost on a division, 1387; 3rd R. of B., 1388; assent, 1430.

(154) An Act further to amend the Act relating to the culling and measuring of timber in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1193; 2nd R. *m*, 1294; in Com. and rep. from Com., 1326; 3rd R. *m*, 1388; assent, 1430.

(155) An Act for the final settlement of claims made by the Province of Manitoba upon the Dominion.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1193; 2nd R. *m*, 1301; in Com., rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 1329; assent, 1430.

(156) An Act to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into Canada.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R*, 1193; 2nd R. *m*, and ref. to Com., 1295; deb. 1295-1300; in Com., 1326; *Mr. Almon's* Amt withdrawn, 1327; Com adjd, 1329; 3rd R.*, 1410; assent, 1430.

(157) An Act to amend the several Acts relating to Duties of Customs and Excise.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1397; suspension of 41st rule and 2nd and 3rd R's, 1414; assent, 1430.

(158) An Act to authorize the granting of further subsidies to, and making further provision for, the construction and efficient operation of the railways therein described.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1369; 2nd R. *m*, 1398; debate, 1398-1410; 2nd R., on a div., 1410; in Com., 1415; Amt. to 1st clause (*Mr. Trudel*) lost on a div., 1415; Amt. to same clause (*Mr. Bellerose*) do. do; Amt. to same cl. (*Mr. Power*) do. do; Bill rep. from Com., 1417; 3rd R. *m*, 1417; Amt. as to route of Short Line) *Mr. Power*, 1417; ruled out of order, 1418; Amt. (as to clause 1) *Mr. Trudel m*, 1418; ruled out of order, 1419; Amt. (as to 1st section), *Mr. Bellerose m*, 1419; ruled out of order, 1420; Amt. (as to Short Line) *Mr. Power m*, 1420; ruled out of order, 1421; 3rd R. carried, 1421; assent, 1430.

(159) An Act for facilitating the navigation of the St. Lawrence River in and near the harbor of Quebec.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, suspension of 41st rule, and 2nd and 3rd R's, 1429; assent, 1430.

(160) An Act to authorize grants of land to members of the Militia Force lately on active service in the North-West.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st and 2nd R's 1425; 3rd R., 1429; assent, 1430.

(161) An Act to amend the Act 46 Vic., chap. 9, intituled, "An Act to provide for the salaries and superannuation and travelling allowances of certain Judges of certain provincial courts.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R*, 1397; suspension of 41st rule and 2nd and 3rd R's, 1414; assent, 1430.

(162) An Act to provide a salary for an additional County Court Judge in the Province of Manitoba.—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, suspension of 41st rule, and 2nd and 3rd R's, 1429; assent, 1430.

(163) An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money

for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1885 and the 30th June, 1886, and for other purposes relating to the public service.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*; suspension of 41st rule *m*, and 2nd and 3rd R's, 1413; assent, 1430.

(164) An Act to authorize the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned in aid of the construction of certain railways.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1422; 2nd R., under suspension of rule, 1422; 3rd R. *m*, 1424; assent, 1430.

(165) An Act to continue for a limited time the Act therein mentioned.—*Sir A. Campbell.*

1st R.*, 1412; suspension of 41st rule and 2nd and 3rd R's. 1413; assent, 1430.

Boot and Shoe Industry condition of.

See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks, 136.

Brantford, Waterloo, and Lake Erie Railway Co's. B. (59).

1st R.*, 350; 2nd R. *m*, 382; rep. from Com., 408; concur in Amts. and 3rd R. *m*, 466; assent, 814.

Bridge, Boom, &c. Construction Act Amt. B. (101)—*Mr. Macfarlane.*

1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 536; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 598; assent, 1430.

British Columbia, Timber Regulations in.

Motion for return; *Mr. McInnes* and reply, (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1369.

British Columbia, White Population in.

See "White Population."

British Medical Acts, Correspondence relating to.

M. for return agreed to, (*Mr. Sullivan*) 47.

Building Societies.

See "Insolvent Corporations Bill."

Business, Relative State of, in the Senate and House of Commons, since Confederation.

See *Sir A. Campbell's* remarks, 653.

Canada, Perilous Position of.

In Debate on the Address (*Mr. Alexander*, 10.

Canada, Representation of, at Colonial Exhibition.

See "Colonial and Indian Exhibition Bill."

Canada and France, Steam Communication between, Inauguration of.

Inquiry (*Mr. Pelletier*), reply (*Sir A. Campbell*), 664.

Canada, Increase of Indebtedness.

See *Mr. Scott's* remarks on Public Loan B., 1056, and also *Mr. Power's*, 1069.

Canada Congregational Missionary Society's B. (54)—*Mr. Vidal.*

1st R.*, 302; 2nd R. *m*, 369; rep. from Com. and 3rd R. *m*, 408; assent, 814.

Canada Co-operative Supply Association B. (81)—*Mr. Ryan.*

1st R.*, 429; 2nd R. *m*, 522; rep. from Com. and 3rd R. *m*, 599; assent, 814.

Canada Southern & Erie & Niagara Railway Co's. B. (9).—*Mr. Plumb.*

1st R.*, 130; 2nd R. *m*, 178; rep. from Com. and 3rd R. *m*, 331; assent, 814.

Canada Temperance Act, Exemption of Wine and Beer from, &c.

Petition presented (*Mr. Smith*) (937).

Canada Temperance Act, Petitions concerning.

Declaration as to genuineness of signatures, presented (*Mr. Scott*), 988; remarks (*Mr. McMillan*), 989; explanation (*Mr. McMillan*), 1036.

Canada Temperance Act, Petition of Presbyterian Church in reference to Amts. H. of C.

Presented (*Mr. Vidal*), 1122

Canada Temperance Act and Liquor License Act Amt. B. (92).—*Mr. Vidal.*

1st R.*, 587; 2nd R., postponed, 622; 2nd R. *m*, 665; debate, 665-684; deb adj. *m*. 684; deb. cont'd, 687-705; M. in Amt. (3 months' hoist) *Mr. Dickey* 696; deb. adj., 705; deb. continued, 711-723; deb. adj., 723; deb. concluded, 728-33; Mr. Dickey's Amt. withdrawn, 732; 2nd R., 733; going into com. postponed, 790; postponed again, 813; Mr. Power's M. (three-fifths of votes polled to be required) 852; quest. of order raised (Mr. Vidal) 852, and Mr. Botsford, 853; Speaker rules M. out of order, 854; in Com., 855; clause 2 amended, 855; clause 3 amended, 857, on clause 5, Mr. McMillan's Amt. (as to medical practitioners) agreed to, 859.868; further Amt., 869-70; Mr. Almon's Amt. (permitting sale of light wines and beer) moved, 873; debate, 873-98; adopted on a div., 898; rep. from Com., 898; on concur in Amts., Mr. Vidal moves for postponement, 914; Mr. Dickey's amt. (that the Amts. be now concurred in) carried on a div., 918; 3rd R. postponed, 923-27; 3rd R. postponed again, 932; 3rd R. *m*, 946; deb. 946-987; Mr. Power's Amt. (majority of three-fifths of votes polled instead of one-half to be required) rejected on a div., 972; Mr. McMillan's Amt. (as

to sale by medical practitioners) carried on a div., 974; B. in Com. again and rep. from Com., 975; on M. for 3rd R. Mr. Nelson's Amt. to 2nd section lost on a div., 976; Mr. Vidal's Amt. (to strike out the clause exempting beer, wine, &c.) *m*, 976; adj. of deb. *m* (Mr. Scott) carried on a div., 987; deb. cont'd, 990-1011; Mr. Vidal's Amt. rejected, 1011; M. for 3rd R. carried on a div., 1011; messge from H. of C. as to Senate Amts. recd., 1095; Amts. of the Senate adhered to, 1153-1167.

Canadian Pacific Railway—Construction of.
In debate on the address; (*Mr. Alexander*), 12.

Canadian Pacific Railway—Western Terminus of, in British Columbia.
M. for Ret. (*Mr. McInnes*), 1123-37; Remarks (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 1137; (*Sir A. Campbell*), 1137-40; (*Mr Power*) 1140; (*Mr. McInnes*), 1141; Mr. Macdonald 1142; motion agreed to, 1143.

Canadian Pacific Railway Employees Relief Association B., (75).—*Mr. Scott.*
1st R.*, 554; placed in the orders *m* (Mr. Scott) 596; 2nd R. *m*, 613; rep. from Com. and 3rd R. *m*, 640; assent, 814.

Canadian Railway Completion B., (153).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 153; 2nd R. *m* (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1305-1318; debate, 1318-1328; M. agreed to, 1326; in Com., 1344; Amt. (terminus in British Columbia to be at Port Moody) *m*, 1345; debate, 1353-69; Amt. rejected on a div., 1369; rep. from Com., 1369; on 3rd R. Amt. (insertion of certain words (*Sir A. Campbell*) *m*, agreed to, 1369; deb. on 3rd R., 1370; Amt. (lien of Govt. to apply to English Bay extension) *Mr. Power m*, 1379; withdrawn, 1385; Amt. (terminus to be at Port Moody) *Mr. McInnes m*, 1385; lost on a div., 1386; Amt. (no change in terminus for ten years) *m Mr. McInnes*, lost on a div., 1387; Amt. (as to harbor at English Bay) *Mr. Power*, lost on a div., 1387; 3rd R. of B., 1388; assent, 1430.

Canadian Pacific Railway—Indebtedness of.
See Sir A. Campbell's Remarks (1207).

Canned Goods B., (U.).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 931; 2nd R, *m*. 942; In Com., 1025; *rep.* from Com., 1029; 3rd R. *m*., 1033; Amts. of House of Commons agreed to, 1396; assent 1430.

Cape Traverse Branch Railway—Cost of Construction, &c.
M. for Return (*Mr. Botsford*), 370; Remarks (*Mr. Dickey*), 371; (*Mr. Hayihorne*), 372; agreed to (*Sir A. Campbell*), 373.

Census Taking—the *de facto* and *de jure* systems.
See Debate on the 2nd R. of the "Manitoba Census Bill," 123, &c.

Central Bank of New Brunswick B., (40).—*Mr. Wark.*
1st R.*, 513; 2nd R. *m*, 536; rep. from Com.; concur in Amts. and 3rd R., *m*, 640; assent, 814.

Chapais—the late Senator.
Tributes of Respect to; (*Sir A. Campbell*) (*Mr. Scott*), (*Mr. Trudel*), 1389; (*Mr. Flint*), 1390.

Chinese—the Exclusion of, from other Provinces than British Columbia.
See Debate on 2nd R. of Chinese Immigration B., 1295.

Chinese Commission—expenditure incurred in connection with.
M. for Return (*Mr. Power*), 459; agreed to (*Sir A. Campbell*), 460.

Chinese Immigration, Restriction and Regulation B., (156).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*. 1193; 2nd R. *m*, and ref. to Com., 1295; deb. 1295-1300; in Com. 1326; *Mr. Almon's* Amt. withdrawn, 1327; Com. adjd., 1329; 3rd R.*, 1410; assent, 1430.

Chinese Immigration Restriction Bill.
Explanation in reference to 3rd R. (*Mr. Almon*), 1411.

Chinese Question, Commission of Inquiry into:
In debate on the Address. (*Mr. Macdonald, B. C.* 6; (*Mr. Sullivan*) 8; (*Mr. Scott*) 16;

Civil Service Acts Amendment and Consolidation B.: (31)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 760; 2nd R. *m*, 825; deb. 825-839; in Com., 898; cl. 3 amended, 899; *Mr. Power's* Amt. to cl. 8 withdrawn, 905; on cl. 346, *Mr. Power's* Amt. (names to be arranged in order of merit) lost on a div., 907; rep. from Com. and concur in amts., 914; 3rd R. *m*, 927-30; 3rd amt. disagreed to in H. of C. and receded from, 1046; assent, 1430.

Civil Service Examination Board, cost of.
See Debate on "Civil Service Act Amts. B."

Civil Service Examinations, and Members of the Royal Society.
Inquiry (*Mr. Trudel*) 408; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 409; further remarks (*Sir A. Campbell*) 428; (*Mr. Trudel*) 429.

Clothing Industry, condition of.
See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks, 138.

Coal Product of Canada.
See *Mr. Read's* remarks, 468

Colonial and Indian Exhibition B. (126) *Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R. *m*, 1052; in Com., rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 1086; assent, 1430.

Commercial Bank of Windsor B. (117)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R. *m*, 1051; rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 1083; assent, 1430.

Commercial Condition of Canada.
See "Industries and Manufactures."

Committees, Sessional.
Library; Printing; Banking and Commerce; Railways, Telegraphs & Harbors; Contingent Accounts; Standing Orders and Private Bills; Senate Debates; appointment of; *m* (*Sir D L Macpherson*) 23.

Competitive Examinations in the Civil Service.
See Debate on "Civil Service Acts Consolidation B."

Confectionery Manufactures condition of.
See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks, 136.

Consolidated Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. (146)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1143; 2nd R.*, 1192; In Com., 1293, Rep. from Com., 1294; 3rd R. *m*, 1305; assent, 1430.

Consolidated Insurance Act of 1877 Modifying B. (20)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1093; 2nd R. *m*, 1151; In Com. 1177-1181; Rep. from Com., 1181; 3rd R. *m*, 1194; assent, 1430.

Consolidated Militia Act 1883 Amt. B. (152)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1193; 2nd R. *m*, 1273; 3rd R. *m*, 1287; assent, 1430.

Consolidated Railway Act 1879 Amt. B. (Q)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 649; 2nd R. *m*., 685; In Com., 733; dropped, 990.

Consolidation of Dominion Statutes.
See "Dominion Statutes."

Contingent Accounts Committee.
List of members 23; 1st Rep. (Reduction of quorum) *Mr. Howlan*, 29; 2nd Rep. (Various matters) 1413.

Cotton Manufacture, Development of.
See Debate on the "Industries and Manufactures of Canada."

Cox Divorce Case.
Petition of George B. Cox, presented and reception postponed, 25; Petition read and received on M. of *Mr. Ogilvie* 31; M. for dispensing with 72nd Rule, *Mr. Ogilvie*, postponed 34; Petition referred back to Com. 49.

County Court Judge in Manitoba B. (162) —*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, Suspension of 41st Rule, and 2nd and 3rd R's., 1429; assent, 1430.

Cox Divorce Bill. (H)—*Mr. Read.*
1st R. and M. for 2nd R., 106; 2nd R. postponed, 405; 2nd R. further postponed, 513; proof of service, 664; 2nd R. and ref. to Com. *m*. 665; *rep.* of Com. and 3rd R., 736; assent, 1430.

Criminal Cases, Law of Evidence in.
See "Evidence in Criminal Cases."

Crossing from Prince Edward Island to Mainland, Perils of.
See Debate on Mr. Haythorne's Inquiry in reference to "Northern Light."

Customs and Excise Acts Amt. B. (157) —*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1397; Suspension of 41st Rule, and 2nd and 3rd R's., 1414; assent, 1430.

Davis Divorce Case.
Petition of Amanda E. Davis, read and received *m*, (*Mr. Ogilvie*), 26.

Davis Divorce Bill (C)—*Mr. Ogilvie.*
1st R. and M. for 2nd R., 29; 2nd R. postponed, 56; 2nd R (on M. of *Mr. Ogilvie*), 103; ref. to Select Com., *m*, 103; 1st *rep.* of Com. adopted (on M. of *Mr. Dickey*), 104; *rep.* from Com., 111; *rep.* adopted (on M. of *Mr. Dickey*), on a division, 128; 3rd R. (on M. of *Mr. Read*), 155; message to House of Commons, 156.

Debates of the Senate, Extension of Circulation of.
Remarks (*Mr. Alexander*) 24; (*Mr. Power*), 25.

Debates, Report of, Expunging of Speeches from.
See under "Privilege."

Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons B. (26)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 108; 2nd R., 114; Rep. from Com. without amt., 116; 3rd R., 122; assent, 814.

Dewdney, Lieut.-Governor, Letters from and to, as to North-West Troubles.
Motion for Return (*Mr. Trudel*), 644.

Disputed Territory Justice Administration B. (165)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1412; Suspension of 41st Rule, and 2nd and 3rd R's., 1413; assent, 1430.

Divisions :

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B.
On 3rd R.; Mr. Power's Amt. (majority of three-fifths of votes polled in-

stead of one-half to be required) rejected on a division; C 23, N.-C. 25, 972.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B.
On 3rd R ; Mr. McMillan's amt. (as to sale of liquors by medical practitioners) carried on a div.; C. 23, N.-C. 21, 974

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B.
On 3rd R.; M. to adj. deb. on Mr. Vidal's Amt.; carried on a div; C. 26, N.-C. 22, 988.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B.
3rd R of B. carried on a div.; C. 33, N.-C. 19, 1011.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B.
On M. for 3rd R.; Mr. Vidal's amt. (to strike out Clause exempting beer wine, &c.) rejected on a div.; C. 20, N.-C. 31, 1011.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B., Senate Amts. adhered to.
6th amt. (sale of liquor by physicians) adhered to on a div; C. 30, N.-C. 13, 1159.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B.
10th amt. of Senate adhered to on a div ; C. 30, N.-C 13, 1160.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B.
11th amt. (permitting sale of wine, beer, &c.) adhered to on a div.; C 30, N-C. 15, 1167; 12th amt.—the same—1167.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B.
In Com.: Mr. McMillan's amt. to clause 5 (as to sale of liquor by medical practitioners) adopted on a division; C. 35, N-C. 16.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B.
On Concurr in Amts. and Mr. Vidal's M. for postpnt.; Mr. Dickey's amt. (that the amts. be now concurred in) carried on a division; C. 38, N-C. 22, 918.

Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B.
In Com.: Mr. McInnes' amt. (Pacific terminus to be at Port Moody) lost on a div.; C. 12, N-C. 28, 1369.

Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B.
On 3rd R.; Mr. McInnes' amt. (terminus to be at Port Moody) lost on a div. C. 12, N-C. 27, 1386.

Canadian Pacific Railway Completion B.
On 3rd R.; Mr. McInnes's amt. (no change in Pacific terminus for ten years) lost on a div.; C. 12, N-C. 27, 1387.

Divorce Cases—Every motion to be entered as agreed to upon a Division.
See the different cases.

Electoral Franchise B., (103)
On M. for 2nd R.; *Mr. Scott's* amt. (3 months' hoist) lost on a div; C. 17, N-C. 33, 1272.

Electoral Franchise Bill.
On 3rd R.; *Mr. Scott's* amt. (extending manhood suffrage to all the Provinces) lost on a div; C. 12, N-C. 31, 1341.

Electoral Franchise B.
On 3rd R; *Mr Haythorne's* amt. (exempting Prince Edward Island) lost on a div.; C. 15, N-C. 29, 1341.

Electoral Franchise B.
On 3rd R.; *Mr. Bellerose's* amt. (exempting Quebec from provisions of the Act) lost on a div.; C. 16, N-C. 29, 1342.

Electoral Franchise B.
On 3rd R.; *Mr. Bellerose's* Amt. (as to preparation of voters' lists) lost on a div.; C. 16, N-C. 29, 1342.

Electoral Franchise B.
On 3rd R ; *Mr. DeBoucherville's* amt. to Mr. Power's amt. (as to definition of "person") lost on a div.; C. 8, N-C. 29. 1343.

Electoral Franchise B.
On 3rd R.; *Mr. Power's* amt, (as to definition of "person") lost on a div.; C. 13, N-C. 31, 1343.

Electoral Franchise B.
On 3rd R.; *Mr. DeBoucherville's* amt. (insertion of words, "unless he be a Christian,") lost on div.; C. 21, N-C. 25, 1343.

Evans Divorce B., (G).
On M. for 3rd R ; *Mr. Vidal's* amt. (that the 3rd clause be struck out) adopted; C. 19, N-C. 13 367

M. for adjournment (May 8-20).—*Mr. Bellerose.*
Carried on div.; C. 46. N-C. 12. 922.
Mr. Alexander's M for a Com. to inquire into the affairs of the Bank of Upper Canada rejected on a div; C. 1, N-C. 49, 70

Offences against the Person B., (S).
On M. to Concur in Amt ; *Mr. Dickey's* amt. (as to evidence of Wife adopted) on a div.; C. 21, N-C. 12, 813.

Offences against the Person B., (S).
On M. for 3rd R.; *Mr. Almon's* amt. (3 months' hoist) rejected; C 23, N-C. 23; M. for 3rd R. lost on div.; C. 23, N-C. 24, 825.

On Mr. Alexander's M. for a Com. to investigate the affairs of the Bank of Upper Canada.
C. 1, N-C. 49; 70.

Portrait of Sir D. L. Macpherson, Removal of.
Mr. Alexander's M. rejected; (C., 1; N.-C., 52), 47.

Real Property in North-West Territories B. (A).
On M. to Concur in amts.; *Mr. Scott's* M. to refer B. back to Com. to strike out Sec. 8 rejected; C. 18; N-C. 36, 379.

Divorce Cases, exclusion of persons from the Committee Room.
Remarks (*Mr. Plumb*), 156.

Divorce Cases, printing of evidence taken in.
Motion (*Sir A. Campbell*), 322; remarks (*Mr. Odell*), 323; (*The Speaker*), 324; (*Mr. Gowan*), (*Mr. Power*), 324; (*Mr. Almon*), (*Mr. Plumb*), 325; (*Mr. Read*); 326; (*Mr. O'Donohoe*), 327: (*Mr. Bellerose*), (*Mr. Kaulbach*), (*Mr. Dever*), 328; (*Mr. Gowan*), (*Mr. Alexander*), 329; (*Mr. Flint*), (*Mr. Power*), 330.

Divorce Cases, procedure in, change adopted.
Remarks (*The Speaker*), (*Mr. Dickey*), 109; (*Sir A. Campbell*), 110.

Divorce Cases, proof of service of petition, importance of.
In debate on "Hatzfeld Divorce Bill", 32-34.

Divorce Committees, distribution of evidence taken before.
Remarks (*Mr. Power*), 121; (*Mr Kaulbach*) *Mr.* (*Turner*), (*Mr. Gowan*), (*Sir A. Campbell*), (*Mr. Dickey*),121; (*Mr. Plumb*), 122.

Divorce.
See "Cox Divorce Case and Bill," "Davis Divorce Case and Bill," "Smith Divorce Case and Bill," "Evans Divorce Case and Bill," "Terry Divorce Case and Bill," "Hatzfeld Divorce Case and Bill,"

Dominion Drainage Co's. Incorp. B (28). —*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 1143; 2nd R. *m*, 1192; rep. from Com.; concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R. *m*, 1193; assent, 1430.

Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Insurance Assn. B. (55).
1st R.*, 650; 2nd R. *m*, 686; rep. from Com., concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R., 841; assent, 1430.

Dominion Statutes, Consolidation of; Reference of Report to Com.
M. (*Sir A Campbell*) postponed, 80; brought forward and discussed (*Sir A. Campbell*), 302; (*Mr. Alexander*), 321; (*Mr. Wark*), 322.

Dry Dock Construction Act, Amt. B. (108).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 513; in Com. rep. from Com, and 3rd R., 622; assent, 814.

Dynamite, precautions against illegal uses of.
See "Explosive Substances Bill."

Education, superintendents of, in the North-West.
Inquiry (*Mr. Schultz*), reply (*Sir A. Campbell*), 199.

Electoral Franchise B. (103).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1168; 2nd R. *m*, 1194-1200; Amt. (3 months' hoist) Mr. Scott, 1200.06; debate, 1206-53; adj. of deb. 1253; deb. concluded, 1253-72; 2nd R. carried on a div., 1272; in Com., 1276-1287; rep from Com., 1287; 3rd R. *m*, 1329; debate, 1329-44; Amt. (exempting Prince Edward Island) Mr. Haythorne *m*, 1330; lost on a div., 1340; Amt. (extending manhood suffrage to all the Provinces) Mr. Scott, lost on a div., 1341, Amt. (exempting Quebec from provisions of Act) Mr. Bellerose, lost on div., 1342; Amt. (as to preparation of voters' lists); Amt. (as to definition of "person") Mr. Power and Mr. DeBoucherville's Amt. thereto, lost, &c., 1343; Amt. (inserting "unless he be a Christian") Mr. DeBoucherville, lost, 1343; M. for 3rd R. carried on a div., 1344; assent, 1430.

Electoral Franchise, uniformity in.
In debate on the address (*Mr. Scott*), 15.

England, commercial condition of.
See *Mr. Haythorne's* remarks, 228 *et seq.*

English Bay, Extension of Canadian Pacific Railway to.
See "Canadian Pacific Railway."

Evangelical Lutheran Church Synod Incorp. B. (60)—*Mr. McClelan.*
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 530; rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 705; assent, 814.

Evans Divorce Case.
Petition presented, read, and received, on M. of *Mr. Gowan*, 29

Evans Divorce Bill (G)—*Mr. Gowan.*
1st R., 49; proof of service, 112; 2nd R., 113; ref. to Select Com., 114; 1st *rep.* of Com. adopted (on M. of *Mr. Gowan*), 122; *rep* from Com. 198; *rep.* of Com. adopted and M for 3rd R., 280; Amt. adopted, 367; 3rd R. *m.*, 365-368; assent, 814.

Evidence in Criminal Cases Act Amt. B. (6)—*Mr. Power.*

1st R.*, 382; 2nd R *m*, 565; debate, 565-578; M. rejected on a division, 578.

Evidence in Divorce Cases, Printing of Evidence taken in.
See "Divorce Cases."

Exclusion of Persons from the Senate Corridors.
Remarks (*Mr. Alexander*), (*Mr. Dickey*), (*The Speaker*), 105.

Expenditure by Government, Increase in.
See Debate on 3rd R. of Public Loan B. 1061 &c.

Explosive Substances B. (K)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*. 179; 2nd R. *m*. 221; In Com., 276; *rep.* from Com., 278; 3rd R., *m*, 280; assent, 814.

Federal Bank of Canada Bill (10)—*Mr. Allan.*
1st R.*, 256; 2nd R. *m*, 268; *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 350; assent 814.

Financial Status of the Dominion.
In Debate on the Address, (*Mr. Macdonald B. C.*) 6; (*Mr. Sullivan*) 9.

Fiscal Policy of the Dominion.
In Debate on the Address, *Mr. Macdonald (B. C.)* 5; (*Mr. Sullivan*) 9; (*Mr. Scott*) 14; (*Mr. Haythorne*) 20;

Fishery Clauses of Washington Treaty.
In Debate on the Address, (*Mr. Scott*) 17; (*Mr. Haythorne*), 21.

Fisheries of Canada, Value and Importance of.
See *Mr. Howlan's* remarks 1100.

Food, Drugs, and Agricultural Fertilizers Adulteration B. (W)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 931; 2nd R. *m*, 944; in Com., 1039-1044; clause 2 amended, 1039; *rep.* from Com., concurr. in Amts and 3rd R., 1044; concurr. in Amts. of House of Commons, 1118-1167; assent, 1430.

Fort MacLeod Ranch Telegraph Co's Incor. B. (80).—*Mr. Girard.*
1st R.*, 932; 2nd R. *m*, 945; rep. from Com., concurr. in Amts, and 3rd R., 1046; assent, 1430.

Foundry Business, condition of.
See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks, 133.

France and Canada, steam communication between.
See Canada.

Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Co's Incorp. B. (50)—*Mr. Wark.*
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 523; rep. from Com.; Concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R. *m*, 685; assent, 814.

Free-Trade and Protection, relative merits of.
See debate on the "Industries and Manufactures of Canada."

Frog Lake Massacre, announcement of.
Sir A. Campbell, 513

Furniture manufacture, condition of.
See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks, 133.

Gas and Gas Meters, inspection Act Amt. B. (119).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1042; 2nd R.*, 1082; in Com., 1085; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 1086; assent, 1430.

General Inspection Act 1874, Amt. B. (135).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1088; 2nd R. *m*, 1090; in Com., 1097-1108, 1119 1112; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 1122; assent, 1430.

General Miscellaneous Industries, condition of.
See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks, 139.

Globe correspondent and the Senate.
Inquiry (*Mr. Alexander*), 458; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*), 459.

Globe of Toronto, editorial in, reflecting upon the Senate.
Referred to by *Mr. Plumb* and others, 326.

Grand Trunk Railway, injustice done to, by the Government.
In debate on the address (*Mr. Alexander*), 11.

Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Co's Acts Amt. B. (38).—*Mr. McMaster.*
1st R., 302; 2nd R *m*, 369; rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 407; assent, 814.

Greater Canada, representation of, in the Dominion Cabinet.
Inquiry (*Mr. Schultz*), 157; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*), 158.

Half-Breed claims in the North-West, instructions to commissioners, etc.
M. for return (*Mr. Alexander*), 523; reply (*Sir D. Macpherson*), 525.

Half-Breed troubles in North-West.
See "North-West."

Halifax Harbor Masters Act Amt. B. (148)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1093; 2nd R. *m*, 1108; in Com. and rep. from Com., 1167; 3rd R. *m*, 1168; assent, 1430.

Halifax Liquor Dealers Petition.
Read at length on M. of *Mr. Almon*, 616.

Halifax Volunteers, Treatment of.
Remarks (*Mr. Power*), (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 535; (*Mr. Ogilvie*), (*Sir A. Campbell*) 536 and 562; (*Mr. Kaulbach*), (*Mr. Dickey*) 562; (*Mr. Read*) 563; Explanation (*Mr. Power*) 603.

Hamilton, Guelph, and Buffalo Railway Co's. Incorp. B. (77)—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 554; 2nd R. *m*, 612; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 684; assent, 814.

Hamilton Provident and Loan Society's Capital Limitation B. (J)—*Mr. Turner.*
1st R.*, 178; 2nd R. *m.*, 221; *rep.* from Com. *m.*, 370; 3rd R., 390; Amts. of House of Commons concurred in, *m*, 728.

Hatzfeld Divorce Case.
Petition of George L. E. Hatzfeld read and received, on M. of *Mr. Kaulbach* 32.

Hatzfeld Divorce Bill (D)—*Mr. Kaulbach.*
1st R.*, 34; proof of service, 116; 2nd R., 117; ref. to Select Com., 120; 1st *rep.* of Com. adopted (on M. of *Mr. Kaulbach*), 120; petition of wife received and ref. to Com., 130; *rep.* from Com. (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 198; *rep.* of Com. adopted on a division, 276; 3rd R. on a division, 368; assent, 814.

House of Commons and Senate, Relations between in reference to Business.
See "Senate."

Hudson's Bay, Exports from.
Inquiry (*Dr. Schultz*) 199; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 199.

Hudson's Bay, Navigation of.
In Debate on the Address, (*Mr. Sullivan*) 8; (*Mr. Scott*) 17; (*Mr. Girard*) 19.

Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Company.
Suspension of 51st Rule in relation to Petition recommended 157.

Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Company (69)—*Mr. Vidal.*
1st R.*, 554; placed on the Orders, *m*, (Mr. Vidal), 596; 2nd R. (Mr Gowan *m*, 613; rep. from Com., concurr. in amts. and 3rd R., 685; assent, 814.

Hydrographic Surveys in the North-West.
See "North-West."

Imperial Federation.
In Debate on the Address, (*Mr. Macdonald B C.*) 6.

Implement Manufacture, Condition of.
See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks, 134.

Indebtedness of the Dominion, Increase in.
See *Mr. Scott's* remarks, 1056.

Indians in the North-West, expenditure upon.
See *Mr Read's* remarks, 791, &c.

Indians in the Provinces, extension of the Franchise to.
See "Electoral Franchise Bill."

Indians in the North-West, food supplied to.
See *Mr. Read's* remarks, 794.

Indians in the North-West, treaties with.
Inquiry (*Mr. Read*), 791-797; remarks (*Mr. Ogilvie*), 797-798; (*Mr. Flint*), 798; (*Mr. Bellerose*), 801; (*Mr. Power*), 802; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 806; (*Mr. Alexander*), 809.

Indians of the Canadian North-West, information concerning.
M. for return (*Mr. Schultz*), 587; remarks (*Sir A. Campbell*), 595; (*Mr. Alexander*), 595; M. agreed to, 596.

Industries and Manufactures of Canada, circulation of report of Commission upon.
Inquiry (*Mr. Macdonald*, B. C.), 131-141; debate (*Mr. Scott*), 141,154; M. to adj. debate (*Sir D. Macpherson*), 154; debate resumed (*Sir D. Macpherson*), 209-217; M. to adj debate (*Mr. Haythorne*), 217; debate resumed (*Mr. Haythorne*), 222-238; debate adj. *m.* (*Mr. Howlan*), 238; debate continued (*Mr. Howlan*), 280 289; (*Mr. Alexander*), 289-291; (*Mr. Power*), 291-300; (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 300 302; debate adj. *m.* 302; debate continued, (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 383-388; debate adj. *m.*, 388; (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 412-427; debate adj., 427; (*Mr Kaulbach*), 461-465; adj. of debate (*Mr. Read*), 465; debate continued (*Mr Read*), 467-474; (*Mr. Turner*), 474; (*Mr. Lewin*), 477; adj. of debate (*Mr. Flint*), 480; debate continued (*Mr. Flint*), 537-545; (*Mr. McClelan*), 545-554; adj. of debate *m.* (*Mr. McClelan*), 554; further adj., 639; adj. again, 663; debate continued (*Mr. McClelan*), 739-779; (*Mr. Dever*), 779-780; (*Mr. Turner*) 780; (*Mr. Macdonald*), 780 784; (*Mr. Plumb*), 784; debate concluded, 784.

Infectious or contagious diseases affecting animals B. (41).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 735; 2nd R. *m*, 790; in Com., 839; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 840; assent, 1430.

Inquires, debate upon, propriety of motion to adjourn.
Discussion and ruling of Speaker, 154.

Inquiries, subjects to be discussed must be clearly set forth.
See Speaker's Decision, 819.

Insolvency Bill, introduction of.
In debate on the address (*Mr Sullivan*), 9; (*Mr. Scott*), 16; (*Mr. Haythorne*), 21.

Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, and other Corporations Act Amt. B. (N).—*Mr. Scott.*
1st R.*, 4 9; 2nd R.*, 488; In Com., 530; *rep* from Com. and 3rd R, 531.

Insurance Companies.
See "Insolvent Corporations Bill."

Insurance Companies, making of returns by.
See debate on "Consolidated Insurance Bill," 1178 &c.

International Coal Co's B. (51).—*Mr. Ogilvie.*
1st R.*, 350; Placed on the Orders of the Day, *m*, 352; 2nd R. (on M of Mr. Power), 382; Rep. from Com., 407; concur in amts. and 3rd R., 408; assent, 814.

International Exhibition Antwerp.
In Debate on the Address (*Mr. Sullivan*) 9; (*Mr. Scott*) 17; (*Mr. Haythorne*) 21.

Iron Manufacture Condition of.
See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks, 134.

Joliette, Baptisms, Marriages and Burials in.
Return presented (*The Speaker*), 663.

Justices and Magistrates, Summary Proceedings before.
See "Summary Proceedings Bill."

Knitting Industry, Condition of.
See *Mr Macdonald's* remarks, 135.

Lake Erie, Essex, and Detroit River R. R. Co's. Incorp. B. (24)—*Mr. Plumb*
1st R.*, 312; 2nd R. *m*, 411; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 465; assent, 814.

Laws of the Dominion, Consolidation of.
See "Dominion Statutes."

Land Titles Registration, Introduction of Torrens System into the North-West.
See Debate on 2nd R. of "Real Property in North West Territories B."

Leather, Brush, and Broom Industry, Condition of.
See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks, 135.

Legislation in the Senate, Increase of.
See "Senate and House of Commons."

Legislative Work, Increase of, in the Senate.
See "Senate."

Library, Joint Committee upon.
List of members, 23; 1st Rep. (Publication of *Dr. Todd's* Book), adopted on M. of *Mr. Plumb*, 1398.

Library of Parliament.
Report of Acting Librarian presented, (*The Speaker*), 5.

Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. (139)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, and M. for 2nd R., 1095; 2nd R., 1108; in Com., 1168-71; rep. from Com., and 3rd R.*, 1171; assent, 1430.

Life Saving Service at Sable Island.
See "Sable Island."

Lionel Graham's Case.
Inquiry (*Mr. Haythorne*) 389; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 389.

Liquor License Act 1883, Amendment of.
See "Canada Temperance Act Amt. B."

Liquor License Act 1883, B. (134)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1122; 2nd R. *m*, 1171; in Com., rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 1272; assent, 1430.

Liquor, Sale of, by Medical Practitioners and Druggists.
See Debate on "Canada Temperance Act Amt. B."

Liquor Traffic, Revenue derived from.
M. for Return (*Mr. Plumb*), agreed to, 109.

Loan Companies.
See "Insolvent Corporations' Bill."

London Life Insurance Co's. Amt. B. (76)—*Mr. Vidal.*
1st R.*, 932; 2nd R. *m*, 988; rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 1012; assent, 1430.

Machinery Manufacture, condition of.
See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks, 134.

Macpherson, Sir David L., portrait of, removal of.
Motion (*Mr. Alexander*), 45; rejected on a div., 47.

Manitoba and the Dominion, arrangement between.
In debate on the address, (*Mr. Scott*), 15; (*Mr. Girard*), 18.

Manitoba and North West Territories Census B. (21),—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 111; 2nd R., 123; in Com., 279; R. from Com., 280; 3rd R., *m*, 331; assent, 814.

Manitoba and North-Western Railway Co's B. (74).—*Mr. Girard.*
1st R., 650; 2nd R. *m*, 686; rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 841; assent, 1430.

Manitoba Claims, Final settlement B. (155),—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1193; 2nd R. *m*, 1301; in Com., rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 1329; assent, 1430.

Manitoba, patent for lands in.
M. for return (*Mr. Guévremont*), 1046; agreed to (*Sir A. Campbell*), 1047.

Manufactures of Canada.
See "Industries and Manufactures."

Marine Department, Instructions given by, to "Northern Light."
See "Northern Light."

Maritime Court of Ontario, Jurisdiction Extension B., (11).—*Sir A. Campbell,*
1st R.*, 382; 2nd R *m*, (*Mr. Turner*), 512; In Com., 531-535; In Com.

ag in, 534; 1st and 2nd clauses amended. 554; *rep.* from Com., 554; 3rd R. *m*, 564.

Medical Acts, British.
See "British Medical Acts."

Medical Practitioners, registration of.
M. for address (*Mr. Sullivan*), 450; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*), 453.

Messengers, deficiency of.
Remarks (*Mr. Alexander*), (*Sir A. Campbell*), 105; The Speaker, 106.

Metal Manufactures, condition of.
See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks, 137.

Militia Force Land Grant B. (160).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st and 2nd R's, 1425; 3rd R., 1429; assent, 1430.

Ministers, presence of, at Ottawa, during 1883 1884.
M. for return (*Mr. Power*), 159-168; remarks (*Sir A. Campbell*), 168-169; (*Mr. Alexander*), 169-171; (*Mr. Haythorne*), 171; *Mr. Kaulbach*), 172; (*Mr. Macdonald*, B. C.). 173; (*Mr. Power*) M. withdrawn. 173.

Montreal and Moncton, shortest railway line between.
See *Mr Power's* remarks on Short Line Railway, 332, &c.

Montreal Bank Annuity and Guarantee Funds Society B., (48).—*Mr. Ryan.*
1st R.*, 429; 2nd R., *m* 522; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 535; assent, 814.
See Bill (48).

Morning sitting of the Senate.
Motion (*Sir A. Campbell*), 1388.

Musical Instruments Industry, condition of.
See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks, 137.

National Policy, advantages and disadvantages of.
See debate on the "Industries and Manufactures of Canada," 209.

North Shore Railway, Correspondence relating to.
M. for Return (*Mr. Bellerose*) agreed to, 105.

"Northern Light," Instructions given to by Marine Department.
M. for Return (*Mr. Haythorne*) 84; Agreed to (*Sir A. Campbell*) 84.

"Northern Light," Insufficiency of, for the Winter service to Prince Edward Island.
Explanation (*Sir A. Campbell*) 106; remarks (*Mr. Haythorne*), (*Mr. Howlan* 107.

North-West, Condition of Indians in.
See "Indians."

North-West, Half-breed Troubles in.
Inquiry (*Mr. Scott*) 410; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 411.

North-West, Hydrographic Surveys in, Prosecution of.
Enquiry (*Mr. Schultz*) 48; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 48.

North-West, Immigration into.
In Debate on the Address (*Mr. Macdonald B. C.*) 6; (*Mr. Sullivan*) 8; (*Mr. Scott*) 15.

North-West Mounted Police Force B. (T)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 791; 2nd R. *m.*, 840; *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 851; assent 1430.

North-West Mounted Police Force Augmentation B. (144)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1093; 2nd R. *m*, 1115; 3rd R. 1150; assent, 1430.

North-West, Number, Nationality &c. of Government employees in.
M. for Return (*Mr. Trudel*) 644.

North West Rebellion, Information concerning.
Inquiry (*Mr. Wark*) 639; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 639.

North-West Rebellion, Proclamation to Rebels.
Inquiry (*Mr. Haythorne*), reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 723.

North-West Rebellion, Provision for families of Volunteers.
Inquiry (*Mr. Alexander*) 937; remarks (*Mr. Scott*) 938; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 939.

North-West Rebellion, Letters of warning concerning.
M. for Return (*Mr. Alexander*) 1012; remarks (*Mr. Flint*) 1016; (*Mr. Alexander*) 1017; (*Mr. Power*) 1017; (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 1020; (*Mr. Read*) 1021; (*Sir D. Macpherson*) 1022; M. agreed to, 1024.

North-West Rebellion, Official Report of General Middleton.
Presented (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1168.

North-West Rebellion, Government assistance to sufferers.
Inquiry (*Mr. Trudel*); reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1274.

North-West Rebellion, Trial of offenders, Number of Jurors.
Inquiry (*Mr. Trudel*) 1274; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1274.

North-West Rebellion. Vote of Thanks to General Middleton, the Militia, the Mounted Police, &c., for Services.
Motion and remarks (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1390 92; (*Mr. Scott*) 1392; (*Mr. Allan*) 1394; (*Mr. Trudel*) (*Mr. Kaulbach*)

1395; (*Mr. Poirier*) (*Mr. Bellerose*) (*Mr. Power*) 1396.

North-West Rebellion, Investigation by Government into Causes of, and Means of Repairing Damage done.
Inquiry (*Mr. Trudel*) reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1410.

North-West Rebellion Expenses B. (149)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1093; 2nd R. *m*, 1150; 3rd R. *m*, 1168; assent, 1430.

North-West, Superintendents of Education in.
See "Education."

North-West Territories Administration of Justice B. (V).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 931; 2nd R. *m*, 942; in Com., 1025; *rep.* from Com., 1029; 3rd R. *m*, 1033; Amts. of House of Commons agreed to, 1396; assent, 1430.

North-West Territories, Lands in, Disposition of.
Inquiry (*Mr. Wark*) 841; reply (*Sir A. Campbell* 844; remarks (*Mr. Alexander* 845; (*Mr. Howlan*) 845; *Mr. Kaulbach*) (*Mr. Power*) 847; (*Mr. Plumb*) 848; (*Mr. Dickey*) (*Mr. McLelan*) 850; (*Mr. Sutherland*) 851.

North-West Territories, Protection of.
See Mr. Haythorne's remarks, 1116.

North-West, Treaties with Indians in.
See "Indians."

North-West Troubles, Correspondence and Reports Concerning.
M. for return (*Mr. Trudel*) 644; agreed to (*Sir D. Macpherson*) 644; remarks (*Mr. Alexander*) 644; Amt. made (*Mr. Scott*) 646; (*Mr. Power*) 647; (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 648; (*Mr. Bellérose*) 649.

North-West Troubles—Depredations and Damages Committed by Surveyors.
Inquiry (*Mr. Trudel*); reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1035.

North-West Troubles—Half-breed Grievances—Lieut.-Governor Dewdney's Report.
M. for Ret., 1029; (*Mr. Alexander*) 1031; remarks (*Mr. Power*, (*Mr. Scott*) (*Sir A. Campbell*) (*Mr. Trudel*) 1032.

North-West Troubles — Representation concerning Half-breed Claims.
Inquiry (*Mr. Trudel*), 1034; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1035.

North-West, Withdrawal of Troops from.
Inquiry (*Mr. Power*) reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1055.

Offences against the Person Act Amt. B. (F)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R. and M. for 2nd R., 48; 2nd R. *m*, 57; in Com., 108; 3rd R., 481; assent, 1430.

Offences against the Person Act further Amt. B. (S).—*Mr. Gowan.*
1st R.*, 663; 2nd R. *m*, 725; Amt. (3 months' hoist) *Mr. Almon*, lost on division, 728; in Com., 784 790; Amt. to 1st clause (*Mr. Gowan*) adopted, 788; Amt. to 2nd clause (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 788; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Power*) *m*, 789; lost and Amt. carried, 790; *rep.* from Com., 790; on concurr. *Mr. Dickey's* Amt. adopted on a division, 813; 3rd R. *m*, 822; Amt. 3 months' hoist) *Mr. Almon*, 823; rejected on a division, 825; M. for 3rd R. rejected on a division, 825.

Ontario & Pacific Railway Company's B. (72).—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 554; 2nd R. *m*, 598; rep. from Com. and 3rd R, 684; assent, 814.

Ontario Central Prison Act Amt. B. (P).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 523; 2nd R. *m*, 597; in Com., rep. from Com and 3rd R., 615; assent, 1430.

Ontario Maritime Court.
See "Maritime Court."

Order, Privilege, &c.

Censure, Motion of, upon Hon. Mr. Alexander.
See "Alexander."

Procedure in Divorce Cases, Change in.
See "Divorce Cases."

Rules, Suspension of.
See "Rules" in General Index.

Order, *Personal.*
Sir A. Campbell objects to Mr Alexander speaking twice on an inquiry. The Speaker rules Mr. Alexander out of order, 44.
Sir A. Campbell objects to Mr. Alexander's remarks as irrelevant, and the Speaker rules them out of order, 46.
Mr Gowan objects to Mr. Alexander's remarks as being "sharp and taxing" and the Speaker rules them out of order, 60.
Sir A. Campbell objects to Mr. Alexander's remarks on the deficiency of messengers, and *The Speaker* rules them out of order, 106.
Mr. Macdonald (B. C.) objects to relevancy of Mr. Power's remarks in reference to the presence of Ministers at Ottawa; and *The Speaker* rules them out of order, 167.
Mr. Macdonald (B. C.) calls Mr. Alexander to order for using impor-

per language. *The Speaker* rules Mr. Alexander out of order, 171.

Sir A. Campbell moves a vote of censure upon Mr Alexander, which is withdr. upon Mr. Alexander making an apology, 219

Sir A. Campbell calls Mr. Alexander to order for improper language and *The Speaker* rules Mr. Alexander to be out of order, 242.

Mr. Haythorne objects to Mr. Kaulbach introducing English politics into his remarks, 420.

Mr. Plumb objects to Mr. Alexander's remarks on M. for adjournment, 455.

Sir A. Campbell objects to Mr. Alexander's remarks upon M. for adjournment and *The Speaker* rules them out of order. 456

Mr. Power calls Mr. Plumb to order for remarks upon Mr. Alexander reading his speech, 456.

Sir A. Campbell calls Mr. Alexander to order for making untrue statements, 458.

Sir A. Campbell calls Mr. Alexander to order for referring to what took place with closed doors, 459.

Sir A. Campbell calls Mr. Alexander to order for irrelevant remarks, 517.

Mr. Plumb calls Mr. Alexander to order for a personal allusion, 615.

Mr. Power calls Mr. Flint to order for referring to Mr. Alexander as a crank, 615.

Mr. Dickey calls Mr. Alexander to order for making two motions upon the same subject, and a deb. ensues, 599.

The Speaker rules Mr. Alexander out of order, 618.

Sir A. Campbell objects to Mr. Alexander's referring to a past debate, &c, 645.

Mr Power calls Mr. Kaulbach to order for using the word "contemptible" in reference to him, 619.

Sir A. Campbell calls Mr. Alexander to order twice for unparliamentary language, 707.

Mr. Kaulbach call Mr. Dever to order for speaking twice on the same subject, 784.

Sir A. Campbell calls Mr. Alexander and Mr. Macdonald to order for speaking on an inquiry after the reply has been given, 809.

Sir A. Campbell objects to Mr. Alexander's inquiry on the "Public affairs of the Dominion" as being out of order, and *The Speaker* rules that it is so, 817.

Mr Power calls Mr. Dever to order for personal references to Mr. Alexander in debate on the Canada Temperance Act. 881.

Mr. Kaulbach, in Com. on Civil Service Act Consolidation Amt. B., objects to Mr. Alexander referring to the appointment of Librarian; the Chairman sustains the objection, 912.

Mr. Plumb calls Mr. Alexander to order for reading his speech, 1012; *Mr. Botsford* also does so, 1015; *The Speaker's* ruling 1013 and 1015.

Sir A. Campbell calls Mr. Alexander to order for accusing the Govt. of corruption; *The Speaker* rules Mr. Alexander out of order, 1016.

Sir A. Campbell calls Mr. Alexander to order for bringing accusations against the Govt. 1089.

Mr. Bellerose calls Mr. Plumb to order for criticising the decision of the Speaker; *The Speaker* rules Mr. Plumb in order, 1221.

Mr. Dickey raises point of order as to discussion on Mr Haythorne's Amt. to Franchise Bill; *Speaker* rules discussion in order. 1339.

Mr. Plumb calls Mr. McInnes to order for speaking several times on the same question, 1364.

Mr. Power calls Mr. Macdonald to order for irrelevant remarks. 1365.

Mr. Power calls Mr. Plumb to order for questioning the ccuracy of his statements; *The Speaker* rules Mr. Plumb to be in order, 1375.

Mr. Haythorne calls Mr Plumb to order for criticising the conduct of members of the House of Commons; *The Speaker* rules Mr. Plumb in order, 1376.

Sir A Campbell calls Mr. Power to order for imputing motives to members of the House of Commons; *The Speaker* rules that Mr. Power is not out of order, 1402.

Mr. Plumb calls Mr. Power to order for attacking members of the House of Commons; *The Speaker* rules Mr. Power in order, 1403.

Order, *Procedure.*

Mr. Vidal and *Mr. Botsford*, on M. to go into Com on Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. (92), object to Mr. Power's M. in Amt. as being out of Order. *The Speaker* rules it out of order, 852-54.

Privilege, *Personal.*

Mr. Alexander calls attention to instructions having been given to expunge one of his speeches from the debates. 239; remarks (*Mr. Vidal*), 239; (*Mr. DeBoucherville*), 240; (*Mr. Power*), 240; (*Sir A. Campbell*),241; doors closed, 242.

Privilege, Question of, as to debate on adjournment.

Remarks (*Mr. Haythorne*), (*Speaker*), (*Sir A. Campbell*), (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 466.

Privilege, Question of, as to article in Toronto *Mail.*

Remarks (*Mr. Alexander*), 480.

Privilege, Question of, as to accuracy of a statement.
Remarks (*Mr. Power*), (*Mr. Plumb*), 1083.
Mr. Botsford calls the Speaker's attention to the presence of strangers in the Senate, and the doors are closed, 242.

Paper Manufacture, Condition of.
See Mr Macdonald's remarks, 137.

Parliamentary Returns, Bringing down of.
Inquiry (*Mr. Power*), reply (*Sir A. Campbell*).

Parliamentary Returns, Number of, &c.
M. for return (*Mr. Flint*) 514; remarks (*Mr. Bellerose*) 574; (*Mr. Read*), (*Mr. Plumb*) 515; (*Sir A. Campbell*) 516; (*Mr. Alexander*) 517.

Pawnbrokers Further Provision B. (R).—*Mr. Gowan.*
1st R.*, 663; 2nd R. *m.*, 723; In Com., 736-738; *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R. *m.*, 738; assent, 1430.

Penitentiary of St. Vincent de Paul, Investigation into.
See "St. Vincent de Paul."

Petitions for Private Bills.
Time for receiving extended, on M. of *Sir A. Campbell*, 51.

Poirier, Senator.
Added to the Library, and Standing Orders and Private Bills Com., 352.

Pontiac & Pacific Junction Railway Company.
M. for Return *Mr. Trudel*) 1092; agreed to (*Sir A. Campbell*) 1093.

Pontiac & Pacific Junction Railway, Cost per Mile of.
M. for Return (*Mr. Trudel*) agreed to, 1411.

Port Moody as the Western Terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway.
See "Canadian Pacific Railway."

Port Moody, Railway Engine House at, Building of.
Inquiry (*Mr. McInnes, B.C.*), reply (*Sir A. Campbell*, 1047.

Portrait of Sir David L. Macpherson.
See "Macpherson."

Practice.

Inquiries—The subject of the Inquiry must be specifically stated.
See Speaker's ruling as to Mr. Alexander's Inquiry.
Usage in the Senate of permitting speeches upon inquiries and motions, 817.

Preservation of Peace near Public Works Act Amt. B. (O).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 523; 2nd R. *m.*, 596; In Com., *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 623; assent, 1430.

Prince Edward Island, Accident to Ice-Boats, &c.
Inquiry (*Mr. Haythorne*) 28; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 28.

Prince Edward Island, exclusion of from operation of Franchise Bill.
See *Mr. Haythorne's* Amt. on 3rd R., 1330.

Prince Edward Island, winter communication with.
In debate on the address (*Mr. Haythorne*), 22.

Prince Edward Island, winter communication with, provision for by the Govt.
Inquiry (*Mr. Haythorne*), 81; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*), 84.

Prince Edward Island, winter communication with, intentions of the Govt.
Inquiry (*Mr. Haythorne*), 85 and 102; remarks (*Mr. McFarlane*), 90; (*Mr. Howlan*), 91; (*Mr. Power*), 94; (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 97; (*Mr. Gowan*), 99; (*Sir A. Campbell*), 100.

Prince Edward Island, tunnel communication with.
Inquiry (*Mr. Howlan*), 489-504; remarks (*Mr. Haythorne*) 504-506; *Mr. Kaulbach*), 506; (*Mr. Botsford*), (*Mr. Bellerose*), 507; (*Mr. Wark*), 508; (*Mr. Ogilvie*), 508; (*Mr. Ferrier*), 509: (*Mr. Power*), 510; (*Sir A. Campbell*), 511.

Printing, Joint Committee upon.
List of members, 23.
1st *rep.* (reduction of quorum) (*Mr. Read*), 31.
2nd *rep.* consideration postponed, 49; 2nd *rep*, adopted, 104.
3rd and 4th *reps.* adopted, 130.
5th *rep.* (documents printed), 368.
6th *rep.* (increase of salary), 612.
7th *rep.* (documents to be printed), 1024.
8th *rep.* consideration postponed, 1253.
9th *rep.* (documents to be printed), 1292.
10th *rep.* (printing, officials, &c.) 1397.

Prisoners Employment Act Incorp. B. (87).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 898; 2nd R. *m*, 931; 3rd R. *m*, 932; assent, 1430.

Private Bills Com.
See "Standing Orders."

Private Bills, extension of time for receiving.
On 8th *rep.* of Standing Orders Com., 79.

Private Bills, initiation of in the Senate.
See "Senate, increase of Legislation in."

Procedure.

Adjournments, practice as to motions for.
See *Mr. Alexander's* remarks, 454.

Conference between Senate and House of Commons in event of a disagreement, rules concerning.
See discussion on Canada Temperance Act, pp 1154, &c.

Private Bills, difference of procedure as to, in the British and Canadian Parliaments.
See *Mr. Plumb's* remarks, 430.

Prohibition, effect of its adoption upon the prosperity of the country.
See *Mr. Smith's* remarks on Canada Temperance Act, 711.

Prohibition Legislation, practical success of.
See debate on 2nd R. of "Canada Temperance Act Amt. B."

Prohibitory Liquor Law, adoption of by the Provinces.
Petition presented (*Mr. Haythorne*), 616.

Proof of entries in Crown Account Books B. (M)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 352; 2nd R. *m*, 407; In Com., *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 412; consideration of Amts. of House of Commons, 1047; Amts concurred in, 1082; assent, 1430.

Prorogation.
Bills assented to, 1430; Speech from the Throne, 1431; Prorogation by Speaker, 1432.

Protection and Free Trade, relative merits of.
See Debate on the "Industries and Manufactures of Canada."

Provinces, Advances to, from the Dominion Government.
See "Advances to the Provinces."

Provinces, Representation of, in the Privy Council.
See "Representation."

Provincial Courts Judges Act Amt. B. (161)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1397; Suspension of 41st Rule, and 2nd and 3rd R's., 1414; assent, 1430.

Provincial Rights, Placing of, on a proper basis.
In Debate on the address, (*Mr. Scott*) 18; (*Mr. Haythorne*), 21.

Provincial Statutes, Different Consolidations of.
See *Sir A. Campbell's* remarks, 303.

Public affairs of the Dominion.
Inquiry—*Mr. Alexander,* postponed, 514; Further postpmts. 555; 707, 735, proceeded with 817; Quest. of order raised (*Sir A. Campbell*); remarks (*Mr. Power*) 818; decision of Speaker 819; Inquiry ruled out of order, 822.

Public Loan Bill (145)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1048; 2nd R. *m*, 1048; debate, 1048-51; M. agreed to, 1051; 3rd R. *m*, 1055; debate, 1056-1082; M. agreed to, 1082; assent, 1430.

Public Works, preservation of peace in vicinity of.
See "Preservation of Peace &c."

Qu'Appelle Diocese Synod Incorp. B. (39)—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R. *m*, 411; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R., *m*, 465; assent, 814.

Railways, Act relating to—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 5.

Railways, encouragement of, in the North-West Territories.
In debate on the address, (*Mr. Scott*) 16; (*Mr. Girard*) 19.

Railway Land Subsidies B. (147)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1093; M. for 2nd R., 1093; 2nd R. *m*, 1150; In Com., 1175; Rep. from Com., and 3rd R.*, 1177; assent, 1430.

Railway Subsidies B. (158)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1369; 2nd R. *m*, 1398; debate, 1398-1410; 2nd R., on a div., 1410; in Com., 1415; Amt. to 1st clause (*Mr. Trudel*) lost on a div., 1415; Amt. to same clause (*Mr. Bellerose*) do. do; Amt. to same cl. (*Mr. Power*) do. do.; Bill rep. from Com., 1417; 3rd R. *m*, 1417; Amt. (as to route of Short Line) *Mr. Power*, 1417; ruled out of order, 1418; Amt. (as to clause 1) *Mr. Trudel m*, 1418; ruled out of order, 1419; Amt. (as to 1st section), *Mr. Bellerose m*, 1419; ruled out of order, 1420; Amt. (as to Short Line) *Mr. Power m*, 1420; ruled out of order, 1421; 3rd R. carried, 1421; assent, 1430.

Railway Subsidies B. (164)—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1422; 2nd R., under suspension of rule, 1422; 3rd R. *m*, 1424; assent, 1430.

Railways, Government aid to.
See "Debate on 3rd R. of Public Loan B., 1057, &c.

Railways, Telegraphs and Harbors' Com.
1st Rep. (Reduction of Quorum) *Mr. Dickey*, 28.

Real property in North-West Territories B. (A).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 22; 2nd R. M., 70; Debate adjourned 79; Debate continued, 173-178; Debate adjourned (on M. of *Sir D. L. Macpherson*) 178; Debate continued, 179-198; Debate adjourned, (on M. of *Mr. Alexander*) 198; Debate resumed, 199-209; 2nd R. agreed to, 209; in Com., 242-256; Amt, to 12th clause (*Sir A. Campbell*), 258; 22nd clause amended, 263; 32nd clause amended, 268; 72nd clause amended, 274; 108th clause amended, 275; in Com. again, 352-365; 127th clause amended, 365; in Com. again, 373; *rep.* from Com., 374; on M for Concurr. in Amts., *Mr. Scott's* Amt (to strike out clause 8) rejected on division, 374; *Mr. Trudel's* 3 Amts. rejected, 380; *Mr. Dickey's* Amt. (to leave out clause 91) rejected, 381; *Mr. Power's* Amt. (to leave out clause 11), rejected, 381; *rep.* of Com., Concurr. in, and 3rd R, 382.

Red River, Dredging of the Mouth of.
Inquiry (*Mr. Schultz*); Reply (*Sir A. Campbell*); 256.

Registration of Medical Practitioners.
See "Medical Practitioners."

Representation of the Provinces and Territories in the Privy Council.
Mr. McInnes' M. withdrawn, 1388.

Revenue from Liquor Traffic.
See "Liquor Traffic."

Revising Barristers—Appointment and Powers of.
See "Electoral Franchise Bill."

Rigby Judge—Charges Against.
Petition for investigation presented and withdrawn (*Mr. Almon*), 108.

Richelieu & Ontario Navigation Co's Incorp. Act Amt. B. (61).—*Mr. Pelletier.*
1st R.*, 760; 2nd R. *m*, 810; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 841; assent, 1430.

River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Co's. B. (8).—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 111; 2nd R. *m*, 127; rep. from Com. and 3rd R. *m*, 331, assent, 814.

Royal Canadian Insurance B. (43).—*Mr. Ryan.*
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 522; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R. *m*, 587; assent, 814.

Royal Society—Members of, and the Civil Service Examinations.
See "Civil Service Examinations."

Rules:
14th Rule—Suspension of, on M. to adjourn (*Sir A. Campbell*), 945.
14th Rule—Suspended on *Mr. Bellerose's* M. for adjournment, 1033.
21st Rule—Invoked by *Sir A. Campbell* upon *Mr Alexander's* proposed Inquiry into the Public Affairs of the Dominion, 817.
41st Rule—Suspended on 2nd R. of Public Loan B. (145); M. (*Sir A. Campbell*) agreed to, 1048.
41st Rule—Suspension of, to permit passage of Bill (165). Motion (*Sir A. Campbell*), 1413.
41st Rule—Suspension of, to permit passage of Supply Bill. Motion (*Sir A. Campbell*), 1413.
41st Rule—Suspension of, on 2nd and 3rd R's. of Bill (161). Motion (*Sir A. Campbell*), 1414.
41st Rule—Suspension of, on 2nd and 3rd R's. of Customs and Excise Bill. Motion (*Sir A. Campbell*), 1414.
41st Rule—Suspension of, to permit passage of Bills (159) and (162). Motion (*Sir A. Campbell*), 1429.

Rice Lake and Saskatchewan R. R. and Navigation Company.
Petition for leave to present a petition (*Mr. Dickey*), 130.

Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Navigation Co's Incorp. B. (79).—*Mr. Girard.*
1st R.*, 649; 2nd R. *m*, 686; rep. from Com., 816; concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R., 840; assent, 1430.

Sable Island, Life-Saving Service at, improvement in.
Inquiry (*Mr. Almon*), 641; remarks (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 642; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*), 643.

St. Lawrence River Navigation Facilitation B. (159).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, suspension of 41st rule, and 2nd and 3rd R's, 1429; assent, 1430.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Investigation into the affairs of.
M. for return (*Mr. Bellerose*), 555; remarks (*Sir A. Campbell*), 561; (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 561; M. agreed to, 562.

Sault Ste Marie Bridge Co's B. (52).—*Mr. Power.*
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R., *m*, 368; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 407; assent, 814.

Scott Act, majorities in favor of, in the Provinces.
See *Mr. Vidal's* remarks, 668, &c.

Secretary of State Department Acts Amt. B. (102).
1st R.*, 488; 2nd R. *m*, 536; rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 598; assent, 1430.

Senate, The.
Building, Sewerage and Ventilation of.
Remarks (*Mr. Power*) 1044; (*Mr. Plumb, Mr. Kaulbach, Mr. Macdon-*

ald, Mr. Botsford, Mr. Dever, Mr. McInnes, Sir A. Campbell), 1045.

Debates Committee.
List of members, 24; Remarks upon (*Mr. Alexander*) 24; (*Mr. Power*) 25; 1st rep. adopted on M. of Mr. DeBoucherville, 735; 2nd rep. (increase of reporters' remuneration, 1293.

Increase of Legislative Work in. M. for Committee.—*Mr. Plumb.*
M. postponed, 80; postponed again, 179; debate (*Mr. Plumb*) 430-444; (*Mr. Scott*) 444-448; (*Mr. Power*) 448; (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 449; adj. of deb. *m*, (*Mr. Dickey*) 450; deb. postponed, 597; deb. continued (*Mr. Dickey*) 603-612; adj. of deb. *m*, (*Mr. McClelan*) 612; deb. continued (*Mr. McClelan*, 623; (*Mr. Robitaille*) 630: (*Mr. Almon* (632; (*Mr. Power, Mr. Robitaille*) 633; (*Mr. Haythorne*) 633-639, 650-653; (*Sir A. Campbell*) 653-658; (*Mr. Bellerose*) 658; (*Mr. Plumb*) 659; (*Sir A. Campbell*) 662; (*Mr. Scott*) 663.

Membership of.
See Mr. Plumb's remarks, 437.

Committees sitting during adjournment, The Speaker's ruling, 51.

French Language—not used by either the mover or seconder of the Address.
See *Mr. Bellerose's* remarks, 19.

French Minister in the.
Mr. Bellerose calls attention to there being none, 19.

Reading Speeches in the.
Mr. Speaker rules it out of order, 1013.

Robitaille, Hon. Mr., manner of appointment of condemned.
In debate on the address (*Mr. Bellerose*) 20.

Senate and House of Commons, Relations between in regard to despatch of business.
M. for joint com. (*Sir A. Campbell*) 705; remarks (*Mr. Plumb, Mr. Alexander*) 706; (*Mr. Botsford*) 707; (*Mr. Bellerose* 710; (*Mr. Dickey*) 711; M. agreed to, 711.

Senator, New (Pascal Poirier).
Summoned, 239; introduced, 269.

Senators, New.
Summoned—Messrs, William McDonald, Joseph Bolduc, Theodore Robitaille, Michael Sullivan, James R. Gowan, 3.
Introduced—Messrs. McDonald, Bolduc and Robitaille, 3; Mr. Gowan, 22.

Sessional Committees.
See "Committees."

Sewerage and Ventilation of Senate Building.
See Senate Building.

Short Line Railway, application of subsidy voted for &c.
Inquiry (*Mr. Power*), 1143-48; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*), 1149.

Short Line Railway, Reports of Surveys.
M. for Return, (*Mr. Power*), 332-44; debate (*Mr. Bellerose*) 344; (*Mr. Trudel*), 345; (*Mr. Baillargeon*), 346; (*Mr. Alexander*), 347; (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 348; (*Mr. Power*), 348; (*Sir A. Campbell*), 350.

Short Line Railway, Survey of Central or Richmond Route.
M. for Return (*Mr. Power*), 1182-89; remarks, (*Mr. Kaulbach*), 1189-91; (*Mr. Plumb*), 1191; (*Mr. Bellerose*), 1192; M. agreed to, (*Sir A. Campbell*), 1192.

Simpson, Hon. B. D.
Death of, announced, (*Sir A. Campbell*), 427; remarks (*Mr. McClelan*), 428.

Sisters of Charity in North-West Territories Incorp. B. (I)—*Mr. Girard.*
1st R.*, 131; 2nd R. *m.*, 268; *rep.* from Com. and 3rd R., 407; assent, 814.

Smith Divorce Case.
Petition of Charles Smith read and received *m*, (*Mr. Read*), 27.

Smith Divorce Bill (B)—*Mr. Read.*
1st R. and M. for 2nd R., 29; 2nd R. on a division, 51; ref. to select Com. *m.* carried on division, 54; 1st *rep.* of Com adopted (on M of *Mr. Gowan*) 111; *rep.* against by Com., 256; *rep.* of Com. adopted, 368; refund of fees, *m.*, 1275.

Smuggling produced by Prohibitory Laws.
See *Mr. Haythorne's* remarks, 717.

South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Co's. Incorp. Act Amt. B. (37)—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 405; 2nd R. *m*, 411; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R., 465; assent, 814.

South Western Railway, Construction of.
Inquiry (*Mr. Reesor*), 409; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*), 410.

Speech from the Throne.
Delivered by His Excellency the Governor-General, 3; reported and read, 5; M. for consideration (*Sir A. Campbell*), 5; for address in reply see "address."

Speech from the Throne on Prorogation. 1431.

Statutes, Consolidation of, Joint Committee upon.
M. (*Sir A. Campbell*), 302-321; remarks (Mr. *Alexander*), 321-322; (Mr. *Wark*), 322; M. agreed to, 322.

Steam communication between France and Canada.
See "Canada."

Steamboat Inspection Act (1882) Amt. B., (133).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1047; 2nd R.*, 1082; in Com., rep. from Com. and 3rd R.*, 1085; assent, 1430.

Standing Orders and Private Bills Com.
List of members, 24.
1st rep. (Reduction of Quorum), *Mr. Read*, 28.
2nd rep. (Time limited for receiving Petitions for Private Bills), *Mr. Read*, 28.
3rd rep. (Davis and Smith Divorce Cases), *Mr. Read*, 28.
2nd rep. (extension of time for receiving Petitions for Private Bills), *Mr. Lacoste*, 31.
4th rep. (Evans, Terry and Hatzfeld Divorce Cases), *Mr. Lacoste*, 34.
5th rep. (as to Private Bills), *Mr. Lacoste*, 34.
8th Rep. (as to Private Bills), *Mr. Lacoste*, 79.
9th and 10th reps. (*Mr. Read*), 157.
12th rep. (*Mr Lacoste*), 239.
13th, 14th and 15th reps. (*Mr. Read*), 332.

Subsidies to Railways.
Amounts voted in 1882 and following years; see "*Mr. Scott's* Remarks," 1057.

Sugar Manufacture, Development of
See deb. on the "Industries and Manufactures of Canada."

Summary Proceedings — Further Provision B., (L).—*Mr. Gowan.*
1st R.*, 331; 2nd R. *m*, 390; Debate thereon, 390-405; M. for 6 months' hoist (*Mr. O'Donohoe*) lost on division, 405; In Com., 481; 2nd clause amended, 481; 4th clause amended, 484; 6th clause amended, 487; In Com. again, 525; 2nd clause amended, 525; *rep.* from Com., 529: 3rd R. *m*, 536.

Tariff, Inequitable operation of.
See *Mr. Scott's* remarks in deb. on the "Industries of Canada," 144 *et seq.*; also *Sir David Macpherson's*, 209.

Temperance Legislation, Compensation of those affected by.
Petition presented (*Mr. Almon*), 578.

Territories, representation of in the Privy Council.
See "Representation."

Terry Divorce Case.
Petition presented, read, and received (on M. of *Mr. Read*), 30.

Terry Divorce Bill (E) —*Mr. Read.*
1st R.*, 34; proof of service, 110; 2nd R. and ref. to Select Com., 111; 1st *rep.* of Com. adopted (on M. of *Mr. Odell*), 111; *rep.* from Com. (*Mr. Odell*), 238; *rep.* of Com. adopted, 276; 3rd R. *m.*, 331; assent, 814.

The Supply Bill, (163).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, suspension of 41st rule *m*, and 2nd and 3rd R's, 1413; assent, 1430.

Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners B. (150).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1122; 2nd R. *m*, 1175; in Com. and Rep. from Com., 1193; 3rd R. *m*, 1194; assent, 1430.

Tidal observations on Dominion Coast, taking of.
Petition of Royal Society presented (*Mr. Dickey*), 352.

Timber Culling and Measuring Acts Amt. B. (154).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 1193; 2nd R. *m*, 1294; in Com. and rep. from Com., 1326; 3rd R. *m*, 1388; assent, 1430.

Timber Regulations in British Columbia.
See "British Columbia."

Tobacco and Cigar Manufacture, condition of.
See *Mr. Macdonald's* remarks.

Torrens System of Land Transfer, introduction of, into the North-West.
In debate on the address (*Mr. Scott*), 14.

Torrens System of Land Titles Registration.
See "Lands Title &c."

Tracadie Harbor, Improvements at.
Inquiry (*Mr. Haythorne*), 517; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*), 518.

Trading Corporations.
See "Insolvent Corporations Bill."

Treasury Board Constitution Acts Amt. B. (104).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st and 2nd R's, 914; 3rd R. *m*, 927; assent, 1430.

Treaties with Indians in the North-West.
See "Indians."

Tunnel Communication between Prince Edward Island and the Mainland.
Inquiry (*Mr. Howlan*), 488; debate, 504-512.

Upper Canada Bank.
See "Bank of Upper Canada."

Veterans of the War of 1812.
Petitions from, presented (*Mr. Bellerose*), 1274.

Volunteers from Halifax, Transportation of.
See "Halifax Volunteers."

Volunteers from the North-West, Assistance to Families of.
See "North-West Rebellion."

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. (118).—*Sir A. Campbell.*
1st R.*, 931; 2nd R. *m*, 939; in Com., 1024: rep. from com. and 3rd R., 1025; assent, 1430.

West Ontario Pacific Railway Co's Incorp. B. (94).—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R., 711; 2nd R. *m*, 736; rep. from Com., 815; concurr in Amts. and 3rd R., 840; assent, 1430.

Western Terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway.
See debate on Mr. McInnes' motion, 1123.

White population in British Columbia.
Explanation as to mis-statement (*Mr. Alexander*) 22.

Wife, Admission of, as a Witness against her Husband.
See debate on Offences Against the Person B., 125, &c.

Wine, Beer, &c., Exemption of, from Canada Temperance Act.
See "Canada Temperance Act."

Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Co's Incorp. B. (91).—*Mr. Girard.*
1st R.*, 650; 2nd R. *m*, 728; rep. from Com., 815; concurr. in Amts. and 3rd R., 816; assent, 1430.

Winter Communication with Prince Edward Island.
Statement as to progress made (*Sir A. Campbell*, 410.
See "Prince Edward Island."

Woman Suffrage opposed.
See Mr. Bellerose's remarks, 1211, &c.

Wood Mountain & Qu'Appelle Railway Co's Incorp. Act Amt. B. (23).—*Mr. Plumb.*
1st R.*, 302; 2nd R. *m*, 369; Rep. from Com. and 3rd R. *m*, 465; assent, 814.

Wood Manufactures, Condition of.
See Mr. Macdonald's remarks, 136.

Woollen Manufactures, Condition of.
See Mr. Macdonald's remarks, 135.

Work of the Session, Progress made in.
Inquiry (*Sr. Wark*) 1033; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*), 1034.

York Station, Prince Edward Island Railway, Closing of.
Inquiry (*Mr. Haythorne*) 519; reply (*Sir A. Campbell*) 521; explanation (*Sir A. Campbell*) 565; remarks (*Mr. Haythorne, Mr. Wark*), 565.

York Station, Prince Edward Island Railway, Establishment and Abolition of.
M. for return (*Mr. Haythorne*, 619; *Sir A. Campbell*) 621.

02-22 STD ECO
8 032919 996824
www.colibrisystem.com

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 127114954